

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE Selly Oak group of colleges is an enterprising body. It has brought over in one year both Dr. DEISSMANN and Dr. Albert SCHWEITZER, and the lectures they have delivered are now published in two quite remarkable books. Dr. SCHWEITZER's lectures are on *Christianity and the Religions of the World* (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net). They make a small book but one of golden worth. The 'foreword' by Nathaniel MICKLEM, M.A., with its brief account of SCHWEITZER's career, adds immensely to the interest of the book.

Dr. SCHWEITZER holds strongly that all religious truth must in the end be capable of being grasped as something that stands to reason; and that Christianity, in the contest with philosophy and with other religions, should not ask for exceptional treatment but should be in the thick of the battle of ideas, relying only on the power of its own inherent truth.

As a preliminary to his general argument, the author discusses the nature of Christianity and the question whether it can be traced back to Græco-Oriental religious thought. He dismisses this as a fantasy. 'Christianity is the creation of Jesus, whose spiritual background was late-Jewish piety.' Moreover, Christianity differs from the Græco-Oriental and mystery religions in two respects. It is not only a religion of redemption but of the Kingdom of

God; also its ethic is not only negative but dynamic. Jesus said, not 'Free thyself from the world!' but 'Get free from the world in order to work in the world, in order to make it a more perfect world.'

The secret of these differences is that, to Jesus, God is an active God who works in man, and not pure spirituality. In the contrast between the world and God, and in the peculiar tension between pessimism and optimism, lies the uniqueness of the religion of Jesus.

Dr. SCHWEITZER then proceeds to set Christianity over against the world-religions which are to-day striving for supremacy. He puts Islam aside, unexpectedly. It lacks spiritual originality and is not a religion with profound thoughts on God and the world. Its power in the world is based on the fact that it has preserved all the instincts of the primitive religious mind, and is then apt to offer itself to the uncivilized and half-civilized races as the form of monotheism most accessible to them. With Brahmanism, Buddhism, the religion of China, and Hinduism it is different. They are great religions.

Brahmanism and Buddhism are based on the same fundamental ideas—dying to the world and to our own life, escape from transmigration into

pure being, by 'knowledge' and meditation. Here we see the essential difference between these religions and Christianity. It is the difference between the spiritual and the ethical. The God of Jesus is living, ethical Will, demanding ethical activity for the redemption of the world. It is by living for the world that we are free of it.

The religion of China is monistic and thoroughly optimistic. The forces at work in the world are good, therefore true piety consists in understanding the meaning of the world and in acting in accordance with this. God is really the forces of nature and the true aim is to become like them. The error in this view of things is that religion is not a knowledge of the Divine springing from contemplation of the universe. Our real knowledge of God does not come from the world. God is found in ourselves as an ethical Personality. This is, no doubt, dualism, and we accept it with Jesus.

After a review of Hinduism Dr. SCHWEITZER sums up as follows: Religion has not only to explain the world. It has also to respond to the need I feel of giving my life a purpose. The ultimate judgment on a religion is whether it is truly and vitally ethical or not. Under this final test the religions of the East fail. Every rational faith has to choose between two things: either to be an ethical religion or to be a religion that explains the world. We Christians choose the former, as that which is of higher value. We accept all the difficulties of the dualistic view, being ethical theists who apprehend God as a Will that is distinct from the world.

All problems of religion, ultimately, go back to this one—the experience I have of God within myself differs from the knowledge concerning Him which I derive from the world. The God who is known through philosophy, and the God whom I experience as ethical Will do not coincide. They are one; but how they are one, I do not understand. There is no doubt, however, which is the more vital knowledge of God, and it is because

the gospel gives us this knowledge that Christianity is superior to all other faiths.

In DEISSMANN'S new book (reviewed under 'Literature') there is an interesting passage about the Messianic consciousness of Jesus. With many other scholars DEISSMANN regards the experience of the Baptism as the first dawning of this consciousness. He emphasizes the point that this consciousness was not the result of reflection. It was not His fixed and quiet possession but had its flow and ebb. It was not present with Him always with the same intensity. It dawns and disappears and again blazes in heavenly clearness in great hours of revelation before which He then, however, draws back in humility.

Tradition has preserved for us certain of these hours of revelation. One of the most important is the scene in the synagogue at Nazareth where He read the passage from Isaiah. The scene can be easily misunderstood if we suppose Jesus came into the church with the purpose of reading this passage and then announcing that He was Messiah. Rather, as His eye falls upon the words, the illumination comes to Him that He *is* the Anointed One.

DEISSMANN regards it as certain that Jesus claimed to be Messiah. But he does not hold the matter to be vital. 'The Christian Church would still throng round Jesus as Lord, even if there were adequate grounds for denying that He possessed the Messianic consciousness.' All the same the question, if not vital, is extremely important from an historical point of view. This consciousness of Jesus had fruitful results for the general development of Christianity.

It was, first, the cause of His conflict with the authorities, and therefore of His Passion and Cross. Further, it was the cause of the formation of a new religious community. More and more the disciples

who held by the Messianic claim of Jesus were constrained to withdraw from the Synagogue. And so this character of Jesus had a vital part in preparing the way for the Christian Church.

In the third place, the belief of the disciples in the Messiahship of Jesus concentrated attention on His person. Then it was the Messiah idea that gave the force which carried the Person of Christ into the centre of Christianity. And, finally, this centralization of Christianity on the Person of Jesus is of the greatest importance in the development of Christianity as a religion of the people. It does not gather mankind round a system of religious theories but round a Divine personality. And it is this that makes possible the evangelization of the world.

The last section of Principal L. P. JACKS' new book, *A Living Universe* (Hodder & Stoughton), is a discussion upon immortality. Principal JACKS votes for a conditional form of that, and goes quite hot over the theory that the great men existed only to lift the world nearer God, they themselves passing out. That were a 'foul wrong' to him. 'Frankly I would decline,' he says, 'if I had the offer, to be made better on those terms, because I see that it involves a violation of the fundamental principle of a moral world, by using one man as a means to the ends of another, or by sacrificing the interests of one generation in the interests of the generations that are to come.'

Yet, so far as we see it, so far as our vision carries, progress is certainly built up upon that very plan, that and no other, as the graveyards in Flanders and the Cross on Calvary make very clear. The richest thing that one can do with life is to throw it away for others, declared Jesus Christ.

Is that only true on the principle of strictly limited liability, always with the proviso that of course what you give here is nothing worth reckoning out of the eternity at one's disposal. 'Foul

wrong'! Is it such a little thing to be used of God to help men even a small step nearer Him? Is it not arguable, at least as justly, that even God, whose name is love and whose nature is unselfishness, might well almost feel envious of man, if it is in his power to give so utterly, so whole-heartedly, that he can throw away for others all his little all in a way impossible to the Eternal.

The blessed hope of immortality happily has sturdier buttresses than this horror felt by Dr. JACKS. But is not that hope simply that we may have before us an eternity of being used as God's instruments for furthering His ends and helping others, with no thought of ourselves at all?

The day has passed for supposing that any real religious interest is secured by ignoring or denying the cruder elements which attach to ancient Hebrew religion. The more humble its origin is seen to be, the more wonderful does its subsequent transformation become. If religions which had a very similar start achieved so very different a destiny, we can only believe that, in the religious movement represented by the Hebrew people, the Divine Spirit was present and operative with peculiar intensity. There is no occasion, therefore, to regret or conceal the primitive facts.

Now magic is one of those facts, and it is one of the merits of Professor BEWER's book on *The Literature of the Old Testament in its Historical Development* (reviewed under 'Literature'), that he makes frank and frequent allusion to it. We hear of the magic trees in the garden of Eden, which show that 'Israel in common with other nations believed that knowledge and eternal life could be procured by the eating of certain food.' We hear of the miracle-working rod of Moses. And most of all does this magical element come to expression in the Elijah, and especially the Elisha, cycle of stories. There is the magic mantle by which the waters of Jordan were divided, the magic staff by

which Elisha hoped to resuscitate the dead child, the magical influence of the shooting of Joash's arrows on the securing of victory for Israel, and the magical power of Elisha's bones to revive a dead body which came into contact with them. Here, as Dr. BEWER says, is 'wonderland indeed.'

But these things do not imperil the ultimate quality of Hebrew religion, whose distinctive note comes to be a supremely ethical emphasis. At any rate that is the note of the noblest prophetic teaching, as interpreted by Professor BEWER. In the controversy—dealt with some months ago in these columns—which rages round the question whether the earlier prophets regarded the cult as absolutely or only relatively irrelevant to true religion, he supports the more drastic position. 'The pre-exilic prophets rejected the whole sacrificial system' (p. 256), they 'rejected the entire cultic apparatus as contrary to the will of God' (p. 267), whereas, according to the priestly conception, 'Yahweh had connected forgiveness with the cult' (p. 269).

It is pleasant, however, to find Dr. BEWER, in his discussion of the Psalter, recognizing—and the recognition is necessary—that in the songs associated with the Temple cult, the old prophetic teaching has by no means been ignored: rather might we say that it was presupposed. In Pss 15 and 24, e.g., 'no ceremonial requirement is mentioned, and the entire stress lies on social morality; not on cultic cleanness but on moral purity.' 'If I had had iniquity in view in my heart, the Lord would not hear' (Ps 66¹⁸). Such insistence on the absence of any secret evil intention 'shows the endeavour to ethicize the cultic functions in the temple' (p. 373). And elsewhere he reminds us that 'the temple cult of the post-exilic times was actuated by the high thoughts of prophetic teaching.' All this goes to show that love of the cult and emphasis on character are very far from being incompatible.

To readers unacquainted with criticism one of

the most startling features of Dr. BEWER's discussion will be his attitude to the Old Testament historians, especially the Deuteronomistic and the Priestly. The dates and figures of the latter are 'altogether unreliable.' 'The historical sense of the people seems to have perished. History gives way to romance.' 'History is completely rewritten in the interest of dogma.'

Of the earlier Deuteronomistic historians his criticism is almost equally severe. While we admire them for the skill and the power with which they made history a vehicle for the teaching of religion, it is really a history which has been coerced or rearranged to suit their scheme. 'From the side of historiography, it is a catastrophe, since it was the beginning of that development which subordinated history to religion and led to the historical constructions in which facts were made to substantiate dogma.' Of the scheme which controls the period of the Judges and is summarily expressed in 2¹¹⁻³⁶ he says, 'from an historical point of view how distorted and wrong this presentation is! Dogma rules again.'

But this is only one side. The writers are essentially preachers rather than historians; their aim is to bring their people to a knowledge of God and His righteousness rather than of historical fact, and to bring them, through this knowledge, to a practical and effective penitence. The history thus becomes one 'great confession of sin,' and 'one may not withhold one's admiration for this solemn, impressive and effective presentation. How grandly the conviction of the righteous and merciful God of Israel is brought out in the history of His people!'

There is, however, a more surprising thing still, and one less familiar to readers of the Bible. We seldom reflect that the very idea of history had to be discovered, and we seldom recognize that the Hebrews were the first to discover it. Before Israel there were histories, but no history: there were annals, records, chronicles, of various kinds,

but no national history set in the framework of world-history. The Babylonians, the Egyptians, even the quick-witted Greeks had nothing like this comprehensive view of history till centuries later.

And the curious thing is that this large outlook is characteristic of the very earliest of the Hebrew historians, the Yahwist. 'Long before any Greek or Roman historian applied the universal idea to history, it was current in Israel: the history of the world was controlled by a great purpose.' It is in reference to the Priestly historians that Dr. BEWER uses these words. But elsewhere he reminds us that this is one of the controlling ideas of Deutero-Isaiah, and that in this he is but following on the lines already indicated long before by J. of whom he strikingly says, 'The vast horizon which takes in the nations of the world in its sweep, together with the comprehensive grasp of the history from the creation of mankind to the time of David, was a historiographical achievement of the first order.' If Biblical historians do not conform to modern historical standards—and is it reasonable to expect that they should?—at any rate we must not forget the religious energy of their purpose, or their large generosity of vision.

Dr. Shailer MATHEWS, the Dean of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, has a suggestive article in *The Journal of Religion* on 'Theology from the Point of View of Social Psychology.' The general contention is that theology is to be distinguished from philosophy by the fact that it is the product of the group mind while philosophy is accepted or rejected by individuals as such. 'There never was a Platonist General Assembly which adopted a Platonist confession.'

You can see the truth of this when you consider that theologies are really the result of imitation, customs, discussion, conflict, compromise, and successive decisions of groups. Doctrines became

permanent which were held by a dominant political or social group. Heresy is always the belief of a defeated party. It is equally true that doctrines synchronize with the creative epochs of European history. The Hellenistic social mind gave us the doctrine of the Trinity. The Roman social mind developed an imperialistic Church. Out of the collapse of this Roman creativeness came our doctrine of original sin and the sovereignty of God. Feudal practices found expression in the Anselmic doctrine of the Atonement. And so on.

Religious faith was co-ordinated when the relations of man to God were described according to the contemporary social order. The vocabulary of historical orthodoxy is that of social experience. 'Decrees,' 'Representative,' 'Election,' 'Guilt,' 'Satisfaction,' 'Sovereignty,' 'Justification'—these terms are not philosophical but juridical or political.

In the same way the attitude of faith to Jesus was described in terms which embody the developing attitude of the groups of believers: 'the Way,' 'Lord,' 'Logos,' 'Son of God,' on to '*homoousion*.' The terms are all chosen as clarifying group belief. And, on another side of the matter, we see doctrines being formed to justify and explain and perpetuate the practices of groups. How else account for the doctrines of the mass, baptismal regeneration, worship of the saints, the use of images, and the infallibility of the Pope?

The practical value of these facts is considerable. It shows, for one thing, that theology is functional. Each doctrine is developed as it is needed by the Christian communities of a certain period. Doctrines were re-examined and re-stated in new social conditions. A striking instance of this is the transformation of the primitive Jewish Christian Messianic concept into the Nicene doctrine through successive stages of Pauline and Johannine teaching and the Logos philosophy of Alexandria. It is impossible therefore to form a theological formula of unchanging scientific content.

Conclusions follow from this. Members of groups with the same loyalties and values can use the same terms with differently defined content. Take as an example 'the Son of God.' That is one conclusion. Another is that terms which no longer express a religious value or a group loyalty ought to be abandoned. The weakness of Confessional theology is that it perpetuates such terms, and thus helps to bring theology into contempt among the rank and file of Christians. The question of 'the order of the decrees,' *e.g.*, has no meaning for men to-day.

There are other elements of value in the main contention referred to. But, perhaps, the one of immediate importance is the necessity of finding terms which will embody the social attitude of our own day. The conception of God as King, *e.g.*, and the doctrine of the Sovereignty of God are capable of re-statement in terms of the democratic life of modern times. The analogy will have to lay stress on the immanence of God which is one of the supreme rediscoveries of our time. This does not imply that the values in the experience of the past will disappear. These will persist, but they will be differently expressed.

Two books have come to hand this month, which display curiously opposite attitudes to the Bible. The one is on *The Failure of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament*, by the late Mr. Arthur PHILLIPS, M.A., the other is *A Literary Guide to the Bible*, by Professor Laura H. WILD, B.D.

Professor WILD, as the title of her book suggests, believes that the Bible can be, and should be, treated as Literature. Mr. PHILLIPS denies this. 'It is misleading,' he tells us, 'to speak of the religious writings of the Jewish nation as a literature.' He quotes more than once with sorrowful disapproval Bishop Ryle's dictum that the external form and composition of the message of the Bible are 'entirely human.' He refers frequently with

vexation to the 'human analogies' which are so often adduced in discussions of the literature or the religion of the Bible. But what other analogies are there?

The American Professor, on the other hand, goes cheerfully on her way, rejoicing in the analogies which Mr. PHILLIPS deprecates—the folk-lore, the myth, the legend, the fable, the allegory, the dirge, the lyric, and numerous other types whose presence in the Bible it is impossible to deny; and she clinches her point by referring to, and quoting sometimes *in extenso*, apt and striking parallels from the other literatures of the world.

What is the truth on this matter? Is Mr. PHILLIPS right or is Professor WILD right? Is the Bible fairly regarded as literature or is it not? Surely the truth of the matter is this, that whatever else, or whatever more, the Bible may turn out to be after a long and intimate experience of its spiritual power, it begins by being literature. If literature be defined as the noble expression of great thought, the Bible may surely claim to fall within that category. Or is it to be excluded, because it happens to be 'sacred' thought, or thought about 'sacred' things? Perhaps, in the last analysis, this attitude is subconsciously inspired by that unhappy dualism which has blinded men to the essential sacredness of all noble things.

Is there no biography in the Bible? What of the perennially fresh patriarchal stories, and more especially the exquisite and inimitable story of Joseph? What of the story of the life of our Lord, told now from this angle, now from that? Doubtless the aim which inspired Old and New Testament stories alike was not a literary aim, nor even a strictly historical one, it was a religious aim; but none the less the result is literature. St. Luke did not say when he began to compose his Gospel, any more than St. Paul when he wrote his Epistles, 'Go to now, let us make a worthy contribution to the literature of the world.' No thought could have been farther from their minds; but partly

because of this entire and self-less absorption in their mighty theme, the result is literature.

Is there no history in the Bible? Why, some of the most competent and unprejudiced critics have declared that there is, in its own *genre*, no finer piece of historical writing in the world, than that part of David's career recorded in 2 S 9-20. And are we to discount the Book of Acts as literature, because it happens to deal with the beginnings of the Christian Church? Or shall we not allow this wooden estimate to be corrected by the thrilling story of the shipwreck in chapter xxvii.?

Is there no oratory in the Bible? To say nothing of the magnificent and impassioned eloquence of prophets like Amos and Isaiah, is there in all the world a more moving speech than that in which Judah pleads before Joseph that Benjamin be permitted to return to his aged father?

Is there no poetry in the Bible? One of its very oldest poems, the song of Deborah, is one of the

greatest of war-ballads: one of its dirges—the lament of David over Saul and his beloved Jonathan—stands conspicuous as one of the noblest tributes ever paid to human worth. The so-called Song of Solomon is now recognized to be a charming collection of love-songs, associated with the wedding-week. And what shall we say of the Book of Job, that incomparable drama of a soul's struggle from doubt through despair to resignation and trust?

It seems almost idle at this time of day to labour so obvious a point; but obvious as it seems to be to those trained to an appreciation of literature, it is a point that thousands of those who love the Bible intensely have clearly failed to grasp. It is true, of course, that the Bible is dominated from end to end by a deliberate religious purpose—'these things are written, *that ye may believe*.' It is true that while its voices are many, its voice is one. But that voice, or those voices, spoke through all the literary forms of those ancient days—how indeed else could it speak?—and through the sheer simplicity of those forms it continues to speak to men for ever.

St. Paul and Æschylus.

BY J. RENDEL HARRIS, LITT.D., LL.D., MANCHESTER.

IN discussing, some time since, the question of a possible acquaintance on the part of St. Paul with the greatest of the Greek tragedians, we tried to show that the words of reproof which rang through the mind of the Apostle at the time of his conversion, and warned him that the yoke of the Gospel was already on his neck, and that further resistance was useless, were in reality a Greek proverb, of which traces could be found in Æschylus and elsewhere.

So the question was raised as to the Apostle's acquaintance with the *Agamemnon* or the *Prometheus Vincit*, in which the proverbial terms about 'kicking against the pricks' are involved.¹

¹ Cf. Euripides, *Bacch.* 794-5:

θύοιμι' ἂν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον ἢ θυμούμενος
πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζοιμι, θνητὸς ὢν, θεῷ.

Pindar, *Pyth.* ii. 94.

The proof was far from complete. Objection could be made that the voice from heaven spoke to Paul in Hebrew, and that, in any case, neither the Greek language, nor any particular Greek author, had a monopoly of the figure of speech employed. Let us see, therefore, if we can find another instance of the influence of Æschylean language on the Apostle's thought and expression.

In reading the *Eumenides* of Æschylus, I was struck with an apparent echo from the tragedy in the Pauline letter to the Philippians. In the closing scene of the play, which is surely one of the most sublime in the whole of the Greek dramatic literature, we have a representation of a great reconciliation which has taken place between the Erinyes or Furies, who stand for the ancient law of the vendetta, and the Athenian people, who are set, in jury, to try Orestes for the murder of his mother.

Apollo has come on the scene to defend Orestes, and initiate sweeter manners and purer laws. Athena is there, too, first as representing the authority of the All-Father Zeus, where Apollo has expounded the Father's mind, and second, as the warden-goddess of Athens, for whom she desires a harmonious civic life, alien alike to the despotisms of the past and the threatening anarchies of an unquiet and factious populace.

In the hand of Æschylus, Athenian politics are transmuted, by a fine alchemy, into conformity with the fundamental precepts and claims of religion. In this closing scene, then, the Erinyes, or Eumenides, have accepted the subordinate position which Athena has assigned them, and are being led away in a splendid procession, with lights and songs, to the place appointed them, under the Areopagus. The chorus refrain begins :

χαίρετε, χαίρετ' ἐν αἰσιμίαισι πλούτου,
χαίρετ' ἀστυκὸς λεώς, ἵκταρ ἡμενοὶ Διός.

to which Athena replies with a speech that begins :

χαίρετε χὺ εἰς,

and the chorus responds :

χαίρετε, χαίρετε δ' αἴθις, ἐπανδιπλοῖζω
πάντες οἱ κατὰ πόλιν, δαίμονές τε καὶ βροτοί,
Πάλλαδος οἶκον νέμοντες.

It was natural that one should be struck with the assonance of this first line of the antistrophe of the chorus, with the verse in Philippians (4⁴) where St. Paul, drawing near to the close of his letter, says :

χαίρετε ἐν Κυρίῳ πάντοτε· πάλιν ἐρῶ, χαίρετε·

for the ἐπανδιπλοῖζω of Æschylus (whatever be the correct form of the curious word) might very well be explained by a Scholiast as πάλιν ἐρῶ. When I had satisfied myself as to the substantial equivalence of the contrasted sentences, it was interesting to see that the same parallelism had been noted (i) by Lightfoot and (ii) by Verrall. Both of these writers explain that χαίρετε has a double meaning, ranging from 'rejoice' to 'good-bye,' and both give the Philippian reference; but neither appears to take the matter any further.

For example, Verrall says on l. 997 :

χαίρετε, both *fare well* and *farewell*.
St. Paul, *Philipp.* 4⁴ ;

while Lightfoot says :

Phil. iii. 1, χαίρετε] *farewell*. At the same time the word conveys an injunction to rejoice :

Phil. iv. 4, πάλιν ἐρῶ] compare Æsch. *Eum.* 1014 :
χαίρετε, χαίρετε δ' αἴθις, ἐπανδιπλοῖζω.

Neither of these writers seems to have recognized that the language to which they refer is a dominant and recurrent note both in the tragedy and the epistle. It has long been observed by spiritual writers that χαίρειν is a fundamental note in the Epistle to the Philippians (*e.g.* Lightfoot quotes Bengel as saying 'Summa epistolæ gaudeo gaudele' : with equal truth it might be said of the Eumenides, 'Summa tragœdiæ χαίρετε, χαίρετε.'¹)

Perhaps this will come out clearly, if we turn to Verrall's translation and notes, and we begin with the choric refrain, when the procession is being formed by Athena to conduct the Erinyes (now accepted as the guardians of Athens) to the lower regions :

Chorus. Farewell, O well may ye fare, in duly divided wealth. Blessings on the folk of this city, who sit nigh Zeus, who are loved by the Virgin beloved, who are coming to wisdom at last. Ye are under Pallas' wings, and the Father regardeth you.

ATHENA. To you likewise blessings and farewell.

Emprison there whatever may do Athens hurt ; and, whatever may profit her, send forth to make her victorious. . . . Between fellow-citizens, let there be goodwill towards what is good.

Chorus. Farewell and (twice be it said) again farewell, all ye in this country, who inhabit Pallas' town. To us, here dwelling with you, be pious, and your lot in life shall give you no discontent.

The translation brings out clearly enough, that the closing passage of the great drama has for one of its notes the definitely repeated χαίρετε of the Pauline Epistle.

But this is not all. The drama is a religious appeal for concord and unity among Athenian citizens, and the action between the gods and goddesses fair, and the dark divinities of the

¹ The repetition of χαίρετε, without the explanation that there is a repetition, would be insufficient proof of influence. It is natural in Greek as in English to repeat the greeting ; *e.g.* we may compare Eurip. *Hippol.* 63, 1455.

underworld, is a moral lesson to Athens itself, whose citizens have been united in winning a great war, but are unskilled in building the foundations of a great peace. There is a noble exposition of this call for concord in the Introduction to Verrall's work, where his language, under the influence of the sublimity of the tragedy, becomes almost Biblical. 'Superlatives' (he says) 'are hazardous ; but nothing in art will easily be found more beautiful, in the simple and popular sense of the word, than the closing scene of the *Eumenides*, from the conversion of the Erinyes to the exit. It is the very perfection of concord, of harmony, of solemn joy and rapturous awe, happiness that provokes no fear, and fear that is no burden on happiness ; of that peace and that union within and without, which the world does not offer, nay, seems to forbid, but which yet must be hoped, dreamed, supposed, believed, as an ideal possible and existing to thought and faith, if the struggle of life and travail of creation is to have purpose and meaning—all this enhanced by contrast with the sharp and persistent discords which precede.'

One can imagine some person reading this passage, detached from the *Eumenides*, to which it is a preface, and saying that he has found a new commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians (with Verrall also among the prophets). For here also there are repeated appeals for the cessation of discords and the establishment of abiding peace : appeals to the community and to particular individuals to be of one mind, to practise mutual forbearance and sweet reasonableness (*τὸ ἐπεικέες ὁμῶν*, 4⁵), to stand together in one rank in the spiritual warfare, and to do everything without murmurings or disputings. Here also men are reminded of the value of the citizenship which they enjoy, for the Philippians also were an *ἀστικός* *λεώς*, whom the Apostle urges to make the ascent from a terrestrial *πολίτευμα* to a heavenly. Write Philippi for Athens, and a large part of the Drama of Reconciliation can be re-enacted. Verrall, too, is almost apostolic and quasi-Philippian in the summing-up which he makes of the underlying politics of Æschylus, who is 'for the middle way, neither tyranny nor anarchy ; and above all things, preaches respect for the law and internal concord, to which, as a final object-lesson, the whole play leads up.'

We started our inquiry with the observation of a curious coincidence in language : we conclude by expressing the belief that St. Paul knew this great play, either by reading or by scenic representation, and that his own moral lesson to the Philippians was under the influence of the great appeal which Æschylus had made to the Athenians, five hundred years before.

The suggestion that Æschylus's play was known to the Apostle either by reading, or by scenic representation, need occasion no surprise, for both methods of dramatic culture were available in the more important Greek cities. For instance, we may compare Alexandria with Tarsus, and Philo with Paul. One might read treatise after treatise of Philo without discovering that Hellenic culture had reached his mind by any other road than the study of philosophy. But when we come to that noble tract the *Quod omnis probus liber*, we not only have a dissertation upon Stoic philosophy, decorated with quotations from the Greek poets—pearls from Æschylus, Euripides, and others—but a story of his own experience in the theatre at Alexandria, where a play of Euripides, the *Augē*, now lost, was being performed. Here is his account :

'And it happened not long ago, when some actors were representing a tragedy, and repeating those iambics of Euripides :

"For e'en the name of freedom is a jewel
Of mighty value ; and the man who has it
E'en in a small degree, has noble wealth."

I myself saw all the spectators standing on tiptoe with excitement and delight, and with loud outcries and continual shouts, combining their praise of the sentiments, with praise also of the poet, as having not only honoured freedom by his actions, but having extolled its very name.¹

Here we see one of the greatest of Jews following, with intense interest, the representation of a play of Euripides. Surely then, we need have no hesitation in admitting that a tragedy so noble as the *Eumenides*, read or witnessed, and especially its closing scene, may have exercised a profound influence upon the mind and speech of St. Paul.

¹ Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber*, c. 19 (tr. Yonge).

Literature.

JESUS AND PAUL.

It is extraordinary how the pendulum swings in the critical and theological world. Those who are not yet old can remember when the watchword 'Back to Jesus' dominated everything in New Testament interpretation. This cry found expression, e.g., in Dr. Bruce's 'Kingdom of God.' Paul was regarded as a corrupter of Christianity which was to be found in its purity in the Synoptic Gospels. But all this is very much in the past already. Harnack himself, who tries to save as much of the Tübingen business as possible, confesses it is a wreck and only a few spars can be found floating about. To-day there is a new appreciation of Paul and a new attitude to him everywhere, and Matthew Arnold's remark that 'the reign of the real St. Paul is only beginning' is having somewhat notable confirmation on all sides. Two books which have recently been issued give expression to this reaction. One is by Professor Adolf Deissmann, D.D., *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net); the other, *The Faith of St. Paul*, a Study of St. Paul as the Interpreter of Jesus, by the Rev. D. M. Ross, D.D. (James Clarke; 6s. net). Both books are conservative in their general tendency, and this is all the more significant because the writers are both evangelical broad-churchmen. Deissmann does not mention the reaction of which he is an exponent. His aim is to expound the religious experience of Jesus and Paul, and to expound it in each case as the centre and soul of the life and ministry. In dealing with Jesus, Deissmann makes an observation which is not only acute in itself but reveals the method by which he reads the 'secret' of Jesus. He protests against the critical treatment of the teaching of Jesus which lays it all out under so many heads. That is not the way to reach the truth in the Gospels. The right way is by 'indirect observation.' Take an incident like the sermon at Nazareth and regard it as a flash of light into the soul of Jesus. Take one after another, saying and event, and look into the heart of Jesus and you will find the truth about Jesus. This truth is the depth of His communion with His Father, a life in God so real, so simple, so profound that it revealed to Him, what

was in reality the final truth, that He was *the* Son of God.

The lectures on Paul in Deissmann's book are extraordinarily impressive. His main point is that the whole Paul is given in one truth, his communion with the living Christ. Theology has sorted out his 'doctrines,' such as justification, sanctification, and the like. But this is all a mistake. There is only one thing in Paul, his 'mystical' experience. This is the oratorio. These 'doctrines' are only *motifs* in it. This is the jewel. These doctrines are only facets of it. This thesis is followed out in a series of chapters which are always fascinating and often revealing. His pages on mysticism, e.g., and its two subdivisions are enlightening. Altogether this book is a real gift to the religious world. It is simple and easy, but it is always penetrating and often original.

Dr. Ross has made other contributions to theology, but he has not done anything better than this book on Paul. He sounds the keynote of it in the preface in a clever phrase. He answers the older cry of 'Back to Jesus from Paul' with this other watchword coined by himself: 'Back to Jesus *with* Paul.' In other words, he contends that Paul is no innovator but the loyal (and successful) interpreter of Jesus. Paul uses different language, because it is the language of his training and culture and time and world, but what he *says* is in substance what Jesus said. His master-thought was goodness. That is the lesson of the autobiography in Ro 7. That also is the meaning of his conversion. How to be a good man was the central problem to Paul. His 'theology' is just a statement of the sufficiency of God for this end. Grace is for the sake of goodness. To prove this may be said to be Dr. Ross's objective in his book. To this end he sets himself to study Paul's life and Paul's teaching, and he establishes Paul's dependence on Jesus. Both studies are scholarly and competent, and the results of both are presented in an easy and popular way. Dr. Ross's book takes a wider range than Dr. Deissmann's. There is more in it; it is more thorough and in some ways far more satisfying. Both writers perhaps 'press' a little, but both will contribute to a truer appreciation of the great

Apostle. The heart warms to men who, like these two authors, have learned to love and admire Paul.

THE LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

All who love the Old Testament owe a debt of gratitude to Professor Julius A. Bewer, Ph.D., of Union Theological Seminary, New York, for the elaborate and invaluable sketch of it which he presents in *The Literature of the Old Testament in its Historical Development* (Milford; 22s. 6d. net). Excellent work of a similar kind has been done before—by Kautzsch, Budde, and H. T. Fowler; but this imposing volume of four hundred and fifty-two pages is the most exhaustive treatment that the subject has yet received. Yet, while the accuracy of the true scholar is stamped upon every line of it, it is so simply written that a reader with no expert knowledge whatever could read it from beginning to end not only with interest and profit but with real enjoyment.

Needless to say, it rests upon a very thorough examination of the literary sources; but it is with the results, as they affect literary history and interpretation, rather than with the critical processes, that Dr. Bewer is concerned. It is all to the good that he has plentifully besprinkled his pages with original translations of passages which illustrate his argument, both prose and poetry; for in an age when so much is written about the Bible, while the Bible itself is so little read, nothing is more important than to keep its noble words perpetually before the minds and eyes of readers. The result is that we can follow here with ease the wonderful march of the Hebrew spirit across the centuries, from the ancient song of revenge in Gn 4 to the great apocalypse of Daniel. Interesting suggestions are dropped, too, in unobtrusive ways. Dr. Bewer believes, *e.g.*, that the whole of Dn 1-7 was originally written in the popular Aramaic; but its author later 'wrote in the sacred language, the Hebrew (chs. 8-12), and when he combined the two parts he translated 1¹-2^{4a} into Hebrew. Most probably he intended to do this for the rest of the first part too, but he was prevented by some reason or other, perhaps by death, from carrying out his aim.' Scholar and plain man alike will be stimulated by this thorough and comprehensive discussion, which leaves no aspect of Old Testament literature untouched.

GOD IN HISTORY.

This is an ambitious theme, which has an endless fascination alike for the historian, the philosopher, and the theologian; but it is handled with power and illumination by the Rev. Professor James Strahan, M.A., D.D., in his recent book, *God in History* (James Clarke; 6s. net). Naturally, as an Old Testament scholar, Dr. Strahan limits his great theme to the consideration of God in Old Testament history; but he is a humanist as well as an accurate scholar, and he heightens the intrinsic interest of his unusually interesting discussion by drawing upon his wide knowledge of literature. His pages are lit up with quotations not only from historians like Macaulay, Gooch, and Bury, but from writers like Carlyle, Tennyson and Browning, George Eliot and R. L. Stevenson, Johnson and Madame Guyon, and many another. The interest in Hebrew religious thought attested by Dr. Strahan's earlier books, his 'Hebrew Ideals' and his fine and deservedly popular commentary on Job, is here allowed to play about the concrete facts in which Old Testament biography and history abound; but the discussion is not confined to these aspects of the Old Testament, it ranges over the whole of the literature, and lays the Psalter, the Wisdom Books, and Prophecy, no less than the historical books, under contribution, compelling us to feel that the records of the movement of God's Self-revelation in History 'have an undying interest for both the man of faith and the humanist—who should be one—unequalled in any other memorials of man's life on earth.' In this combination of humanism and faith, Dr. Strahan reminds us of his teacher the late Professor A. B. Davidson, whose wise and trenchant words are frequently quoted.

The discussion grapples with many aspects of the religious life—holiness, purity, the revelation of love, the problem of doubt, the Cross—but always in connexion with the concrete and historical realities of the Old Testament. The book is a literary treat, as well as a theological discipline, and is a notable addition to the 'Humanism of the Bible' Series, which is now all but complete.

DEMOCRATIC RELIGION.

Imperialistic Religion and the Religion of Democracy, by the Rev. William Adams Brown, Ph.D.,

D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton ; 7s. 6d. net), is a fresh study of the varieties of religious experience with a suggested new classification of religion. It may be said at once that Dr. Adams Brown has written a book which deserves, and will doubtless receive, the careful attention of all serious students of religion.

During the War Dr. Adams Brown rendered great service in organizing and unifying the Christian forces of America. The experiences then gained and the difficulties encountered led him to explore anew the reasons which separate Christians and churches. He became convinced that the differences in religion proceed from inherent differences in human nature, and therefore the principle of classification must be sought in psychology. After criticism of previous psychological classifications, as Harnack's, Sabatier's, and Troeltsch's, Dr. Adams Brown suggests a threefold classification to which he gives the names of Imperialism, Individualism, and Democracy.

'By imperialism we shall understand a type of religion, the representatives of which believe that they serve God best when they submit to the control of some existing institution whose supremacy in the world they identify with the triumph of God's will. By individualism we shall understand a type of religion whose representatives despair of satisfaction through any existing institution, and find solace in immediate communion between the individual soul and God. By democracy we shall understand a type of religion the representatives of which are convinced that they serve God best when they discover His presence in other persons and unite with them in the progressive realization of the ideal social order which it is God's purpose to establish on earth through the free co-operation of men.'

After a careful study of these varying types Dr. Adams Brown moves towards practical conclusions. The democratic type he believes to be the religion of the future. Its spirit may be illustrated in the open-mindedness and co-operation to be found among scientists. Within the sphere of religion it is exemplified in the enlarging conception of Christian Missions, and the movement towards Christian unity. All the types agree that 'the final test of religious faith for the individual must be its liberating effect upon the spirit,' and this 'creative experience' may serve both as a 'principle of unity within Christianity' and as a 'test in the conflict of religions.'

A doubt may suggest itself to the reader, whether this democratic spirit in religion, sympathetic, broadly tolerant, striving for co-operation and unity, can coexist with that passionate conviction which has created all the great religions and given birth to all the churches. But it will not be easy to set aside the powerful reasoning of this book, or to escape the uplift of its vision. It is hardly too much to say that Dr. Adams Brown has given us a work which is worthy to rank with James' 'Varieties of Religious Experience,' to which, indeed, it may be regarded as forming a supplement.

DANIEL.

Here is a new book on Daniel, written frankly 'in defence of the orthodox position,' and 'to stem the rising tide of destructive criticism.' It is by Charles Boutflower, M.A., bears the unconventional title of *In and Around the Book of Daniel* (S.P.C.K. ; 16s. net), and comes to us with a hearty commendation from Dr. Pinches. The words quoted might incline the unwary reader to believe that we have here to do with an obscurantist production. This is very far from being the case. The book is a serious and scholarly contribution to a perplexing problem, and the author, though he pleads for a date at the beginning of the Persian period, is willing to admit that there are Maccabaeian interpolations in chap. 11. He brings forward evidence to show that the Persian and Greek words in the book really form no obstacle to an early date, and he skilfully defends the points on which the critics have directed their attack, maintaining, *e.g.*, that the 'Chaldeans' were priests of Bel, and that Darius the Mede is to be identified with Cambyes the son of Cyrus. As against the critics who see in the fourth kingdom the Greek Empire and in the little horn Antiochus, he argues that the former is the Roman Empire and the latter the temporal power of the Papacy. Naturally 9²⁴⁻²⁷ is 'an exact prediction of the times of public appearance of Messiah and of His violent death,' etc. The Prophetic Weeks begin in 458 B.C. and end in A.D. 33. One interesting suggestion is that Cambyes spared the temple of Jehovah in Egypt during his invasion of that country because thirteen years before he had found in a Jew 'the wisest and most trusty counsellor he had ever had.'

Mr. Boutflower has a profound and extensive acquaintance with the original sources, and he has

marshalled his evidence well, bringing forward from inscriptions and other quarters many facts of compelling interest, whether in the end one agrees with his conclusions or not. It is the more to be regretted that both he and Dr. Pinches display an occasional bias against the Higher Criticism, which makes one doubt whether they really understand the reverent and constructive spirit which animates it. Mr. Boutflower, *e.g.*, says: 'That Higher Criticism which, consciously or unconsciously, claims to be higher than Christ, comes to us really from beneath' (p. 293). And to Dr. Pinches we owe the curious words: 'As in the case of the Book of Jonah, the critics attack the Book of Daniel, aiming, through them, their shafts at the Churches.' Surely Dr. Pinches does not mean this seriously. In what sense can reverent investigation be said to be an attack either on the Bible or on the Churches?

The book contains many excellent illustrations, valuable tables of dates, and a good index.

ASSYRIAN DOCUMENTS.

After an interval of twenty-two years volume IV. of *Assyrian Deeds and Documents* (Deighton Bell & Co.; £2, 10s. net) has appeared. The author is the late Canon C. H. W. Johns. In a singularly felicitous biographical sketch Mr. Campbell Thompson well says: 'What Cambridge gained Assyriology lost.' Dr. Johns might have fulfilled the promise given in the preface of volume III. that the remainder of the work would proceed more rapidly, if the course of his life had not been changed by his acceptance of the Mastership of St. Catharine's College. The continuation of the work (not the completion) has now come from Mrs. Johns, and while she admits she has no knowledge of cuneiform she has proved a successful editor.

In volume III. Dr. Johns gave an elaborate commentary on over three hundred texts, which were autographed in volume I. In the present volume some four hundred more are discussed (although not so fully). The greater part of volume IV. is occupied with explanatory notes on texts dealing with sales of houses, sales of landed property, leases, votive offerings, proclamations, charters, schedules.

A Glossary, extending to about one hundred and forty pages, indicates at every point the orderly, even meticulous, procedure of the eminent Assyriol-

ogist. The Glossary will indeed be a great boon to scholars. Any criticism of it is out of the question here. It must be tested by use.

To realize the advance made in his time and by his labours one has but to compare the strictures passed by Dr. Johns on the work of Oppert, Peiser, and Bezold (in the 'Catalogue'). He may now in his turn be criticized, although it is very apparent that most specialists readily acknowledge their great indebtedness to *A.D.D.* Dr. Johns made a specialty of 'joins,' and the hope may be expressed that the publication of these hundreds of tablets, with commentary and full indexes, will result in many parts being brought into their proper place. This recalls the editor's disadvantage in not knowing cuneiform. She allows there are mistakes, but the only serious one observed is on p. 157 f., where fully a page of printed matter requires to be transferred so as to conclude paragraph 897 (on p. 156). That means the notes are attached to No. 642 instead of No. 644, as inspection of the originals makes plain.

THE QUAKERS IN PEACE AND WAR.

Several notable additions have recently been made to the Quaker bookshelf, and the latest is one of the best. *The Quakers in Peace and War*, by Margaret E. Hirst, M.A. (Swarthmore Press; 16s. net), is an historical study showing how far the Friends have maintained their peace testimony in face of actual war. It tells of their sufferings for this belief in many countries, and of their work to relieve the victims of war. It draws largely from manuscript records, and is the first complete study of the subject.

It would appear that the Quakers have not always been consistent in their protest that all war is unchristian. Isaac Penington wrote: 'I speak not against any magistrates or people defending themselves against foreign invasion, or making use of the sword to suppress the violent and evil-doers within their borders (for this the present state of things doth require, and a great blessing will attend the sword where it is borne uprightly to that end).' Barclay of Urie held a similar view. John Bright, in reply to the question whether he was prepared to condemn all war and abolish all means of military defence, said: 'I would advise you not to trouble with the abstract question.'

But Quakerism has officially pronounced on the abstract question, declaring all war unchristian,

and abjuring the use of force, though it may be doubted if the principle has been carried to its logical conclusions.

Force is essentially a non-moral thing, and is manifest as well in the gentle pressure of loving restraint as in the brutal blow. It takes its moral colour entirely from the motive and intention prompting the use of it. Doubtless it is very difficult to be angry and sin not, and it may be thought well-nigh impossible to engage in war from motives of Christian benevolence, and to conduct it in a Christian spirit. But the possibility cannot be excluded. If it be lawful to restrain by force and punish the individual criminal, it must also be held lawful to restrain and punish a criminal nation.

Yet the Quaker testimony against actual warfare and the passions that lead to war has been most Christian and helpful, while the spirit of love they have manifested and the works of benevolence they have wrought are beyond praise. The story of these, as written by Miss Hirst, will be read with interest and sympathy by many to whom the Quaker logic makes no appeal.

SHOEMAKER AND FOUNDER OF MISSIONS.

'It is no exaggeration to call William Carey one of the greatest of God's Englishmen. He broke the way for us all into Asia, and gave his life without an interval for its people.' So Sir George Adam Smith writes of the poor journeyman shoemaker in a Northamptonshire village who was the first instrument in forming a Society for sending missionaries from England to the heathen world. It would have been strange indeed if there had not been earlier biographies of 'the consecrated cobbler,' as Sydney Smith sarcastically described him, but his great-grandson, Mr. S. Pearce Carey, M.A., has now published the result of his researches, both at home and in Calcutta, under the title *William Carey, D.D.*, Fellow of the Linnean Society (Hodder & Stoughton; 12s. 6d. net). If ever a man was led by the Spirit to endure and overcome incredible difficulties it was William Carey, who, counting not his life dear to him, went out to India not knowing in the least the magnitude of the task. But great was his faith, and it never failed him, though confronted by what seemed overwhelming difficulty. What a contrast between the little cottage in Leicester where he carried on his ministry and the fine college

buildings at Serampore, near Calcutta, which is one of the monuments of his forty years' work in India as professor, preacher, teacher, publisher! That the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments might be read and known in every tongue throughout Central and Northern India, this untiring worker never ceased for more than thirty years from his self-appointed task of translation.

A translation of Herr Richard Semon's *Mnemische Empfindungen* or *Mnemic Sensations* has been made by Bella Duffy, with the title *Mnemic Psychology* (Allen & Unwin; 14s. net). The German work was to have been the first of a series of psychological applications of the author's theory of the Mneme, but his tragic death, by his own hand, in December 1918 occurred before any further contribution had been made.

As is well known, Semon's earlier work, 'Die Mneme,' contained a theory of Mneme as a universal principle of organic life, not only individual but also racial. The theory was analogous to, but much more completely worked out than, that of Hering.

To the present work Vernon Lee has contributed an introduction in which she indicates some of the applications of the mnemonic theory in recent psychological literature, pointing out the benefits, both in the way of suggestion and of orderly thinking, that she believes Semon's conception of the Mneme brings into the study of mind. It comes to this, that every conscious moment of our lives is co-determined, both as to content and as to meaning, by the influence of past happenings, conscious and organic; and that the most partial return of an original experience—any element of it—tends to revive the whole complex of sensation which belonged to the original experience in mnemonic or memory form. This is not, of course, a theory that Semon can claim as his own discovery; what is his own is the delicate analysis, the novelty and freshness of the illustrations, and the remarkable unity of the system. One of the most useful features of the work is its insistence on the unity of the organism—that the whole organism takes part in every excitation—sense-organ, nerves, glands, muscles, etc.—that 'sensations,' accordingly, are not single qualities or elementary forms of mind, but abstractions—but emergent points, as

it were, of a mass consciousness—the emergence being effected in its turn by the mnemonic laws.

The translation is readable and fluent, but not always clear, and it suffers as 'Die Mneme' did from the author's medical passion for queer-looking Greek names such as *engram*, *ecphory*, *synchronous* and *accoluthic* sensations, *ecphoric quantivalence* of components, *homophony* of mnemonic sensations.

Ever since the publication of the 'Modern Reader's Bible,' by Professor R. G. Moulton, the view of the Bible as Literature has become increasingly familiar. One of the most recent attempts—and a very successful one—to confirm and illustrate this view of the Bible has been made by Dr. Laura H. Wild, B.D., Professor of Biblical History and Literature at Mount Holyoke College, in her *Literary Guide to the Bible* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). Her method is to select various literary categories, such as Folk-Lore, Story-telling, History, Poetry, Dramatic Literature, Wisdom Literature, Oratory, Essay, and to illustrate their presence in the Bible by quoting and discussing passages chiefly, but not exclusively, from the Old Testament, and often on the basis of modern translations. As the writer, e.g., in the chapter on 'The Art of Story-telling,' deals with the inner impulse that leads to the creation of these various literary forms, and as she enlivens her discussion by parallels drawn from Greek, Arabic, Indian, and other literatures, the result is a highly educative and interesting book, whose value is enhanced by the bibliographies appended to each chapter. To one who has read such a book as this, the Bible can never seem remote and dreary again.

The widow of the Rev. W. Venis Robinson, M.A., has prepared twenty-five of his children's addresses for publication, dedicating them to his grandchildren, and 'all the other children who love grandpa and his books' (*Sunshine and Smiles*: Allenson; 3s. 6d.). This book, like the two earlier ones, *Sunbeams for Sundays* and *Angel Voices*, is the very thing to read aloud to children. The chapters are not so much addresses as stories of children and their doings—not a collection of anecdotes, but longer stories where the children have a real personality. We hope this book will find its way into many homes.

Church union is in everybody's mind and heart,

and any attempt to bring it nearer deserves a welcome. This is the object of *Essays on Christian Unity*, by Principal William Robinson, M.A., B.Sc. (James Clarke; 6s. net). It is a broad-minded book, and a scholarly book as well. The writer acknowledges, as guides to the solution of the thorny questions involved, Scripture, reason, and history. That is to say, while he regards the New Testament as the test and norm, he admits the principle of development on the principles contained in the New Testament. This gives him a good deal of freedom in his outlook and treatment. The book discusses the Foundation of the Church, its Faith, Ministry, and Sacraments, and there are appendices on points of detail. The author rightly sees that the question of the ministry is the crucial question, and gives his strength to this. Opinions will differ as to the measure of his success. But in either case Principal Robinson has done a service to the cause which he has at heart by this scholarly treatise.

It is impossible not to admire the indefatigable industry in the work of research that must have preceded the volume on *The Periodical Essayists of the Eighteenth Century*, written by Dr. George S. Marr, M.A. (James Clarke; 8s. 6d. net). In the preparation of what is really an invaluable and most interesting volume the author has carried on the task of research among one hundred and fifty periodicals of the eighteenth century, of which he gives a list in chronological order. The 'Rambler' and the 'Spectator' are near the head of the list, and are the most familiar. But it will surprise the ordinary reader to find how numerous and varied are the very interesting extracts that Dr. Marr has succeeded by his patient and laborious examination in disinterring from these long-forgotten periodicals.

The Carey Lectures for 1921 were delivered by Professor J. Ernest Davey, M.A., B.D., and have just been published in book form. The subject is the Origins and Development of Christian Forms of Belief, Institution, and Observance, and the title of the volume, *The Changing Vesture of the Faith* (James Clarke; 6s. net). The subject is a vast one, but Professor Davey has brought it into manageable compass by choosing a standpoint. He examines the psychological sources of belief and ritual and custom, and reviews the religious

development of Christendom in the light of these. The book is an examination of the relation of life to form. Life and form (including creed) go hand in hand. Neither can do without the other. There is a danger in their marriage. It is foolish, e.g., to stereotype form in any sense of it. And form must always be brought to the test of experience. 'The Divine order is need, faith, venture, verification, revival,' is a characteristic remark of the writer. Professor Davey's lectures are a noble plea for reality in religion. But the interest of them is many-sided. The author deals with the relation of the Church to creeds, to art, to politics, to music, to ritual, and to much else. The discussion is marked by unusual ability, and the book is in the best sense enlightening and educative.

'Every preacher knows that the abstract cannot be assimilated by ordinary church-folk, who fail to apprehend doctrine except it be clothed in the example of a real personality. In this respect there is no better textbook of Religion than *Acts* . . . for in it we find the flowers growing by the wayside, or freshly gathered; whereas in the formularies of the Faith, they have all the dryness (not to say mustiness) of the herbarium and museum. Might we not go to *Acts* for the verification of Religious Experience?' It is in this spirit the Rev. W. M. Grant, M.A., deals with the Book of Acts in *Ideals of the Early Church* (James Clarke; 5s. net). Mr. Grant has conceived an original idea and has carried it out with unqualified success. His book is an exposition of the religious ideas of *Acts*. There is accurate scholarship behind the exposition, but the author for the most part eschews criticism. He sets out the religious content of the book, and deals with its leading thoughts and its perennial message. In fourteen chapters he handles such subjects as 'The Greatest Question in Religion and its Answer,' 'Jesus in the Primitive Church,' 'The Apologetic of Acts,' 'Cornelius, the Seeker,' 'The Women of the Early Church.' His exposition is lucid, modern, vivid, and practical, and at every point the ancient message is laid alongside modern needs and problems and is illuminated by literary quotations and parallels. This is a book for the preacher and the layman, and the scholar need not disdain it. If you have never preached through Acts, take up this book and you will set about rectifying the omission at once. Principal Cairns writes a strong

commendation of the book in a Foreword. But the book is sure to make its way on its own merits.

A beautiful gift-book has been issued by Messrs. Collins, Glasgow, *The Old, Old Story*, by Professor W. M. Clow, D.D. (12s. 6d. net). Dr. Clow tells the Bible story in simple language which a young child will understand. He seems to us to have accomplished his task with success. The history is well arranged and the titles of the chapters are arresting. A child will read the narrative with ease and with increasing interest. Dr. Clow's name will guarantee the scholarship in the book, but he has not made the mistake of trying to be ultra modern. One feature of the book is the number of lovely illustrations from original paintings by Mr. William Pratt.

To their excellent series of notable personalities entitled 'Makers of the Nineteenth Century,' Messrs. Constable & Co. have now added *Theodore Roosevelt* (7s. 6d. net), by Lord Charnwood, who has already contributed a most attractive study of Abraham Lincoln. President Roosevelt wrote his autobiography, and as almost his whole career from early manhood was in the nature of a great adventure, and as he had the gift of a ready writer, it was a most varied and interesting record. Lord Charnwood, who has written for readers in this country, has done so out of his intimate knowledge of American affairs and with admiration for an American President with a good deal of Lincoln's striking characteristics. Lord Charnwood has succeeded in giving us a full-length portrait of an independent, resolute, and many-sided man who, having been Vice-President of the United States, became President after the assassination of President M'Kinley and was after re-elected President for a full term of office. He was defeated by Mr. Woodrow Wilson. Had Roosevelt been President at the outbreak of the Great War in Europe his indignation against the violation of Belgium by the Germans would probably have brought the United States at once into the conflict. If not, then certainly after the ruthless sinking of the *Lusitania* by a German submarine.

A guide to the detailed study of the Gospels is published under the title of *The Four-Fold Evangel*: *A Short Outline of Gospel Study*, by the Rev. Thomas Stephenson, B.A., D.D. (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d.

net). Dr. Stephenson takes the Gospels as they stand and accepts the Fourth as Johannine. In fifteen short chapters he furnishes reliable direction for independent study. The writer is well acquainted with the work of New Testament criticism, and readers will find themselves in good hands if they take this little book as a basis for such study. It is the result of careful work and is full of suggestion.

Mr. G. K. Chesterton is an amazing person. Not only is he among the wittiest of our writers and the most suggestive of our thinkers—never more so than when on the surface he seems merely frivolous—but, as he has often proved, he has it in him to be a real and telling spiritual force. Certainly in his fine little book, *St. Francis of Assisi* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net—the beginning of the new People's Library, which promises well), what strikes one first is that the author is a spiritual man who believes whole-heartedly in the big things of God, to whom such faith is an essential of his being, who has passed through cleverness at its cleverest to a childlikeness of mind profoundly simple. He is humble about essaying his task at all; but that sense of the greatness of his subject is in itself a credential and inspires confidence. Moreover, there is here the usual vividness of writing. It is a man who saw it who describes the meeting with the leper, the coming of the saint out of the night of purgation of the Dark Ages with the dawn behind him and the singing of birds bursting out around him, or the great vision of the Divine agony, or the humiliation of Francis before he found himself. In this little volume too we have Chesterton's customary aptness of phrase: to him the Crucifixion is not an afterthought and anti-climax or accident in the life of Christ, 'it is obviously the point of the story like the point of a sword'; the ready humour, as in that page of caricature of scholarly pedantry which resolves the story of St. Francis into a sun myth, or better still finds it quite clearly totemistic; the characteristic paradox sparingly used, as, 'a lover of men is very nearly the opposite of a philanthropist. . . . A philanthropist may be said to love anthropoids.' No one can follow Mr. Chesterton without understanding better why the peasant's cast-off clothing with which St. Francis clothed his nakedness, had in ten years become the cherished uniform of five thousand men, of an order that has won a foremost place in our human gallantries and heroisms.

An outstanding volume in the 'Master Missionary Series' which is being published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton is the life of *Mackay of Uganda* (3s. 6d. net). The authoress is Miss Mary Yule. Miss Yule has a delightful literary style, unhurried and picturesque. It may be of interest to readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES to know that she was a member of Dr. Hastings' staff for a number of years.

As she says in the Preface, this life of Alexander Mackay is practically a fresh one, as it is based largely on new material. When Mackay arrived in Uganda he found that he had a firm friend in the late Lieut.-Col. John Robb, I.M.S., and between the years of 1876 and 1887 he wrote to him a series of very intimate letters. These letters Miss Yule has had access to, and has been able to publish for the first time. They show Mackay in a thoroughly human light.

This life, unpretentious though it is, should on no account be missed.

Here is that fine combination, a book worth making, admirably written, and by the man who ought to do it. There are many works on Buddhism, but there is still a place for Dr. J. Estlin Carpenter's *Buddhism and Christianity* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). Every one knows that, far apart though they rose, these streams flow side by side in places in the most surprising fashion. And as the two faiths developed the parallels grew ever more impressive and astonishing, though Dr. Carpenter does not overpress them but notes the contrasts too. In his excellent study the one is taken up, carried so far, and then laid down until the other has been similarly handled, when the former is resumed, and so on to the end—a method that might easily become confusing, but is here triumphantly successful, for the whole thing is lucidity itself. Moreover it is, of course, real scholarship, not too deep for any one to follow, yet, with no sense of crowding, packing into the pages masses of knowledge that took years to collect, and sweeping one along by the sheer interest of the telling. For the fineness of its spirit and the clearness of its statement, for the fullness of its facts and the sanity of its judgment, this book is to be recommended. There is a serviceable bibliography of works on Buddhism in English.

The publishers are to be congratulated on the courage with which they are embarking on new

ventures, and offering the public excellent material at popular prices.

In *The Realm of God*, by the Rev. L. E. Bennett, M.A., B.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net), the writer has done a bold thing. He has added another volume to the already vast literature published in recent years on the Kingdom of God. He has been led to this by the conviction that previous writers, while careful in exposition of the doctrine of the Kingdom, have not 'set it forth wholly and dynamically as the very soul of Christian enterprise, for which our eager, wistful age is waiting.' Accordingly an effort is here made to indicate what the Kingdom of God implies as a practical policy for the Church of Christ to-day. While there is nothing revolutionary in his proposals, the author writes with competent knowledge of his subject, and a fine enthusiasm for the coming of the Kingdom.

A volume of religious essays marked by exceptional freshness and ability comes from the Rev. T. Wilkinson Riddle, F.R.S.L.—*The Quest of Truth* (Kingsgate Press; 3s. 6d. net). In a Foreword Dr. J. H. Shakespeare tells us of the remarkable ministry Mr. Riddle has exercised in Plymouth, where he draws crowded congregations which include many who had given up church-going till they came upon the obscure Baptist Church in George Street. He points out the qualities of this new preacher, his modernness, his courage, and his evangelical loyalty. All these qualities are to be found in the essays in this book. They are all interesting, independent, suggestive, and illuminated by happily chosen citations from literature. 'Pentecost and the Modern Mind,' 'Spurgeon's Pulpit Prayers,' 'The Peril of Extremes,' are specimens of the themes discussed.

In the religious education of the child one of the most difficult as well as important things is a training in prayer. Mistakes are easily made and difficult to set right. *How We can Help Children to Pray* (Longmans; 2s. cloth covers, 1s. paper covers) has been written as a guide in this task, and it is perhaps only necessary to say that it is by Miss Edith E. R. Mumford, M.A., who has already given us such excellent work in 'The Dawn of Religion in the Mind of the Child' and other books. Miss Mumford is a recognized authority on the religious training of the young, and this new book will add

to her reputation and will be a real help to parents and teachers.

Highways and By-ways in the Spiritual Life, by Janet Erskine Stuart (Longmans; 6s. net), shows the writer to have been possessed of a lively imagination and a spirited English style. The papers, however, are mostly in the form of spiritual allegories and morality plays, which only the highest genius can redeem from dullness. Cardinal Bourne in the Preface says that the reverend mother 'meant these papers for the benefit, recreation, or assistance of her religious family.' To give a dramatic representation of how Cock Robin (*The Fair Mind*) was shot by Sparrow (*The Utilitarian*) with his poisoned arrow (*What's the Use*) may have created a ripple of excitement in the placid waters of the nunnery, but is hardly likely to stir interest in wider circles. Yet, withal, there is in this volume a great deal of ripe wisdom and a rich vein of Christian teaching.

Snowden's Sunday School Lessons for 1924 (Macmillan; \$1.25) are a series of expositions of the International Sunday School lessons by the Rev. James H. Snowden. They are very good. Mr. Snowden has the faculty of selection. He does not crowd everything he knows into his exposition, but carefully sorts out the points and gives just enough at one time for one lesson. The syllabus covers the whole of the Old Testament history and the whole of the ministry of Jesus. The book can be cordially commended to teachers and parents.

The Making and Meaning of the New Testament, by the Rev. James H. Snowden (Macmillan), covers a very wide field. Its four sections deal in succession with the background of the New Testament, the books of the New Testament, the life of Jesus, and the spread of Christianity. Obviously it is impossible to deal fully with all these topics, but the writer has succeeded in compressing a very great deal of information into this work. It is fitted to serve admirably the purpose for which it is intended, to be a handbook to Church classes and Study Circles. The exposition is clear, the style vigorous and pictorial, and the spirit warmly Christian.

Mr. P. W. Thompson, M.A., writes his book on *The Whole Tithes* (Marshall Brothers; 6s. net) with the very practical and laudable aim of stimulating

liberality towards the many worthy causes within and without the Church which are crippled for the lack of it. The introductory part is a sketch of the history of systematic giving as set forth in the Old and the New Testaments, for the liberality for which Mr. Thompson pleads is an organized liberality with a very definite Biblical basis; the rest of the book is a practical application of the Biblical principles to the conditions of modern life. The Biblical section of the book will be of little value to one who has been trained to a modern view of the Bible; but it is worth buying for its earnest and reasoned argument for a larger liberality, for the interesting light it throws on the generosity of some of our greatest literary men, and not least for its collection of Biblical texts inculcating the duty of liberality.

Few people unacquainted with the Zionist Movement realize the extent of it. Yet according to Mr. Richard Cadbury, who has given an account of a visit paid by him on behalf of the British Society to the Jews, in company with their Secretary, Rev. Frank J. Exley, to Palestine and Mid-Europe, in a book just published, *Nine Thousand Miles in the Track of the Jew* (Marshall Brothers; 5s. net), Jewish immigrants are entering Palestine at the rate of just under one thousand a month. 'Of all the organizations I am acquainted with,' says the writer, 'the Zionist movement seems to me to be the most carefully organized; not only thought out, but also carried out to its last detail.' The author has much that is interesting to say of this Movement, but the volume is mainly a 'travel' book, dealing chiefly with Palestine, but also describing a visit paid to the Society's stations in Vienna and Danzig.

Mr. Cadbury has a ready pen and has many excellent descriptions of places visited, with reflections on the Biblical stories connected with them. The volume is beautifully illustrated with a large number of photographs taken by the author and reproduced in photogravure.

Three Measures of Meal, by Professor Frank G. Vial, B.D. (Milford; 10s. 6d. net), is a most unfortunate title for a most excellent book. One is led to expect, perhaps, a volume of mediocre sermons, instead of which the book contains a masterly survey of the three civilizations which found their confluence in the City of God. The

three measures of meal are the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Roman, as prepared for the reception of the leaven of the gospel. The manifold action and reaction of the Divine force and the human environment is patiently traced out and lucidly set forth by one who has carefully gone over the whole ground and passed all the material through his own fresh mind. Altogether it is a most noteworthy, sane, and helpful book.

There is a general impression that clergymen are lacking in business habits if not in business capacity. The Rev. Marshall M. Day, B.D., has done his best to rectify this state of things for any who will read his little book, *Business Methods for the Clergy: A Manual for the Desk* (Morehouse Publishing Co., Milwaukee). The titles of the chapters will indicate the lines of this lesson on efficiency: 'A Place to Work, Organizing the Desk,' 'System in the Desk,' 'First Aid to the Memory,' 'An Auxiliary Brain, the Card Index,' 'Little Schemes for Saving Time,' 'The Clergyman as Executive.' All the suggestions made under these heads have been tested in business and in clerical life and have stood the test. The book is written for the student who has finished his course of study and is embarking on his career as a clergyman. It ought to help him, and perhaps others who are not beyond help.

From America there comes a book of rare excellence on the nature of the authority of Holy Scripture—*Inspiration: A Study of Divine Influence and Authority in the Holy Scriptures* (Oliphants; 5s. net). The writer is Mr. Nolan Rice Best, editor of 'The Continent.' We know where we stand when we read that Dr. Marcus Dods said of him: 'Mr. Best is a man who thinks for himself and thinks profoundly.' But the book is written as an eirenicon. Mr. Best is careful and tender towards the ultra-orthodox. The truth is all here, but it is put with balance and moderation. Indeed we may say all that needs to be said in a sentence: a better book to put into the hands of inquiring and disturbed minds would be difficult to find.

Under the title of *The Apostolic Age* (Oliphants; 8s. net), Professor W. B. Hill, D.D., has added a sequel to his life of Christ. The work contains a plain, straightforward account of the Church to the end of the first century. The author has little

space, and less inclination, for descriptive writing. 'To picture the view from the Areopagus, or to describe the monuments of ancient Athens, sheds little light upon Paul's labours in that city.'

The Apostolic Age is represented as 'the supremely great missionary age of the Church,' and is to be studied for the light it throws upon the problem of world evangelization. 'Without a knowledge of the beginnings, the later movements of Christianity are as mysterious as were the rise and fall of the Nile in the days when its sources were unknown.' The general standpoint of the writer is conservative, though he is conspicuously fair in presenting diverse views. No better book could be put into the hands of an intelligent layman desirous of gaining a serviceable acquaintance with the Christian origins.

Messrs. Skeffington have published a volume of sermons by the Rev. R. C. Faithfull, M.A. The title of the volume is *The Word of Christ* (5s. net).

Mr. Faithfull is already known. The sermons in this volume are short, but they are not too short, and a number of them are suitable for special occasions.

Two books on Christian Science were recently reviewed in this magazine, one for and the other against. Another has come to hand with the title *Christian Science versus Popular Religion*, by Mr. Charles H. Lea (Simpkin; 1s. net). The author says that sixteen years' experience has proved to him the truth and inestimable value of Christian Science. His book has been approved by the authorities of that movement and may be taken as

representing its teaching correctly. It includes essays on Prayer and on Spiritual Regeneration from the Christian Science point of view.

The Student Christian Movement has done well by the Gospel of St. Mark. Mr. Oldham's textbook, published a long time ago, could hardly be improved on. But in *The College St. Mark*, by Mr. C. B. Young, M.A. (3s. net), the Movement has done another good deed. This is the second of the 'College Commentaries' Series of New Testament books for educated Indians. It is written and printed in India (there is one error in the list of contents), and it is a creditable product of the Indian College Christian scholarship. There is a good introduction which deals with just the points on which a virgin mind will need to be informed. The R.V. text is elucidated by brief but sufficient notes; and a feature of the book is the general summary of the contents of each section which is to be read before the explanatory notes. This edition will be found as useful here as in India, and especially by students and upper schoolboys. The writer's experience of eastern life enables him to throw light on the narrative in its eastern aspect.

Here is a new edition of *Mad Shepherds*, by Principal L. P. Jacks, D.D., LL.D. (Williams & Norgate; 10s. 6d. net). These tales and studies have a character of their own and are well worth a re-reading. This issue of them is a handsome book, prettily bound, beautifully printed, and with striking illustrations by Leslie Brooke.

'The Lame walk' (Matt. xi. 5).

BY THE REVEREND JOHN A. HUTTON, D.D., LONDON.

THESE words occur as part of the answer which our Lord sent back to John the Baptist. John was lying in prison. He was there by the decree of Herod, who had acted on the whim of a woman whom, together with Herod, John had rebuked for the life they were leading. There he was in the prison of Macherus, on the shore of the Dead Sea, his prison-walls washed by the waves of its desolate waters. It is about as poignant an illustration as one could give of the *apparent* triumph of wicked-

ness in this world. We can well believe that the brave man's heart was near to giving way. We conclude that so it was, from the question which he commissioned some of his disciples to put to Jesus. That question had to be a very direct one, one of those questions which admit of only the answer 'yes' or 'no.'

The Baptist had to learn that you cannot get an off-hand, ready answer, an answer in terms of 'yes' or 'no,' to any of life's really great questions.

The answer from God to the great inquiries is never an unmistakable 'yes' or 'no,' for that would destroy the soul, would interfere with our moral education. A 'yes' spoken once for all by God to life's ultimate questions would paralyse our souls with a too great confidence; and a 'no' spoken once for all to life's ultimate questions would paralyse our souls with despair. God's answer is never an explicit 'yes' or 'no'; but only the secret pressure of His Spirit upon ours. The answer which Jesus sent back to the Baptist was of the same kind as God still sends back to all our questionings: 'Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?' 'Am I wrong in believing? Am I wrong in my estimate of Christ? And in that case, am I wrong everywhere?' And Christ's answer to him was, 'The lame walk.' It was part of Christ's wonderful manner that He would not give Himself a name. It was His plan to be Himself, to become for man all that He could become, and leave it, not to the world as the world, but to those who in every age have been drawn to Him by secret and indestructible affinities, to *say out* what they have found Him to be. Jesus Christ is *there*: we see what He has been; we know what He has it in Him to be for this world of ours; and it is left to us to answer our own questions, and to say whether He is not for us the wisdom and the power of God.

My subject, however, is not that. I wish to consider, not the situation in which Christ used these words, 'the lame walk,' but these very words themselves. Obviously, Jesus in using such words in the circumstances in which He did use them is describing what in His view was and is the characteristic feature or result of His appearance and work in the world of mankind. What is that characteristic feature?—'The lame walk!' That is to say, Jesus Christ came into the world to work a miracle. He came into the world to do something for man for which there was no other way. He came in order to break up the tyranny of all natural and moral consequences. He came in order so to deal with us that we one by one should have a new beginning. He came in order, if there should be need, to make an abrupt entrance into our lives, in order to plant something or Someone at the very root of our being, who should make all the difference in the world. When we deny the miracle which Christ is ready to work, we are not faithful to Him.

It is perfectly true that the Christian religion assumes what in theology is called the doctrine of the Fall of Man. It assumes that in some profound way the race of mankind had gone wrong. For practical purposes, it declares also that every one of us has in some way gone wrong; or at least that there is something in each one of us which needs to be put right. There is something in each of us which might well be altogether different, stronger, steadier, holier. That—in one aspect of it—is the implication of the Fall.

I wonder what many people mean who become angry over that great doctrine. They say that it is a disparagement of man. I do not think so. It is a disparagement of you and me and everybody in particular; but it is not a disparagement of *man*, the child of God. On the contrary, the doctrine of the Fall is the doctrine of the essential dignity and erectness of man. Only he can fall who has it in him to stand erect. We must hold to the doctrine of the Fall, if we are to hold to the doctrine of the essential and—God willing—the final erectness of man. The doctrine of the Fall simply declares that we men and women are naturally not ourselves, that we are not by nature, and can never by merely natural processes become, what God had in His mind when He proposed us. Is that a disparagement of man? Do I disparage you if I say that you are not the man it is in you to be? Do I disparage you if I tell you that God meant something bigger and better for you than, it may be, you are dreaming of? Would you rather that I said that you are all the man you could ever have been, and that throughout eternity you will be the same? The only alternative to the Christian doctrine of the Fall—the doctrine that man has come down and is not now himself—is the doctrine of human perfection. The alternative to the doctrine that we are naturally all wrong is the doctrine that we are naturally all right. Now, if you tell me that I am all right, I am depressed and miserable; for in that case life is a poorer thing than I had thought. But if you tell me that I am all wrong, I ought at least to start up, either to answer you, or to examine myself; and, if I find reason, I shall pray God to put me right.

To take an illustration which at the same time will lead us to the very text. Suppose I am walking behind some one whom I know, and presently I overtake him. I say, 'I am glad to see you, and

glad to see how briskly you can go along.' Whereupon he looks at me displeased, and says, 'Surely you cannot mean it. As a matter of fact, I am going lame just now!' Why is the man displeased? Why is he right to be displeased? It is because I said something which meant that I thought he could walk no faster than he was walking, that I thought he was all right when he was not all right; and his displeasure at me is just the fine protest of a man against being taken for something no better than he seems, against being judged by his mere appearance, as though he could be nothing more. We may have often wondered that good people like our fathers could rejoice in the doctrine of the Fall. We need not wonder; they saw in it the deeper and the thrilling doctrine that, according to God's way of considering us, we are better than we have become, that our behaviour all along in this world has been, as we say, beneath us, not according to our dignity.

Now Christianity is built round about that same doctrine. It declares that until we have been treated, until we have received from Christ something which He came to give to us, we all go lame. It declares that we are not ourselves until we are more than ourselves; and that we do not even begin to be ourselves until something has happened between Christ and our secret personality.

Let us keep hold of this idea of lameness as signifying that condition of moral impotence, of weakness and stumbling, or of dullness and deadness to God which is our average and natural condition until Christ makes us different. In what follows, I mean now by 'lameness' something more precise; I mean *that*, within each one of us in particular, which is hindering us from living our full happy life as a child of God, under God's sky, with God's secret resources. Upon this, I shall say what I have to say under four propositions.

And first: there are those who are *born lame*. There is a sense in which this is true of all of us: that we are none of us free and untrammelled, ready to run in God's ways, until Christ makes us free. But I am speaking now of varieties of this general condition; and I say there are those who are born lame.

We have become aware in our day as never before of how the generations are bound to one another, how the sins of the fathers may be visited upon the children. I say, *may* be visited; and even the severest science cannot say more.

Heredity—certainly on the moral side—is not a doom, but only a condition. In a world governed by God we dare not say of anything evil, that it *must* be. Indeed, we dare say, on the contrary, of every evil that exists, that it need not be, that there are resources in God for its overthrow. Though it is only of recent years that we have learned so much of the material processes of heredity, the thing itself has always formed part of the knowledge of the human race. The Bible knows the doctrine that because 'the fathers have eaten sour grapes, the children's teeth are set on edge.' But the Bible declares that what God is working for in this world is to overthrow that fatal sequence. God is working for a state of things, as Jeremiah says, when every one shall suffer for his own sin, and not for the sin of his fathers. And we believe that there is in Christ this very power to rescue every man from the dead hand of his ancestry. The great thinkers of Greece were engaged all the time with this very question—how was the evil which one generation had set a-going in the world to be contradicted, transformed, brought to a standstill, and finally cast out? And it was given to them to see very deeply into that great inquiry. They saw, as in the *Antigone* of Sophocles, that if one of the fated line, even herself, were to allow the guilt of the house of Laius to have all its way with her, if one were, in utter meekness and without one moment's revolt, to submit to the dark wave of evil consequence, in her stricken soul the evil thing would die. Or, to put it otherwise, if one were to arise in the fated line who was ready to suffer, who was ready to sacrifice her fair chance of life without complaining, that such a one would implant in the race a new and holy motive, which would counteract the fatal drift and change it into a tide towards God.

I verily believe that this has been done in Christ. Our fathers did well to protest that Christ had done something for the whole world of men, apart from what He could do for each of us, one by one. They did well to protest against Arminianism, and to claim for Christ's Passion a world-wide and eternal significance apart from the understanding and acceptance of it. And it is when we think of hereditary evil that we seem to get a glimpse of that world-wide significance. In dying as Christ died, there was impregnated into the world of mankind a new motive; there was let loose

amongst the world-forces a new and blessed force—something which is now *there*, fighting against the tyranny of mere natural consequences ; something which each hard-pressed soul of man can lay claim to as a power on his own behalf, and also as a reason for believing that He who is with him is more than all that is against him !

I say there are those who are born lame. And Christ would fain make these walk and leap and sing. There is something that can come closer to us than the threatening of our natural blood ; it is the holy grace of the spiritual blood of Christ.

Then there are others ; for, secondly, there are those who are *lame as the result of an accident*. There are those who to-day are what they are, and not better than they are, because of a sin, or because of a life of sin. They have done something wrong, something against the light, and they know it—and go lame. It may be that some one who reads these words is in that very case. Well, if Christ cannot heal us, no one else can heal us. It is too great a subject to go into now, the subject of the very possibility of forgiveness. We simply say in Christ's name that every one who sincerely repents of his sin, who bemoans it, who puts himself humbly in Christ's hands to bear witness of Him in the world—that every such one is forgiven, is back in the love of God. The Bible, the world, are full of such people, God be praised, whom Christ has healed of this kind of lameness—the lameness that comes with actual transgression.

Then again, there are those who are lame *because they are weary, because they are footsore*. They are getting older. Some of the visions of youth have failed. Life has broken for them some of its promises. The way for them now lies on a dead level of grey monotony, with no fine heights from which they can look away beyond immediate things. It is the spiritual danger which besets us all from the mid-time of our life and onwards. In the case of many there have been sorrows in addition, disappointments from children, or disappointments from themselves, which have the effect of bringing them to a standstill. It is a bad form of lameness this. And yet with this also Christ can deal, making the lame ones walk. For the peril of our condition at such a time is that we consent to the view that because in some ways this life has failed us, all has failed. There is the danger, too, at this stage, that we lose something

of our first natural heroism and that we fall into a mood, desiring mere physical comfort, and estimating life by what it *gives* rather than by what it asks from us and keeps in reserve. And Christ heals us of this lameness, in part by arousing our minds to what is really happening within ourselves. He came to show us that this world is not to be seen by itself, but always in its relation to another world and to God's will ; that the things which are seen are temporal, and the things which are not seen are eternal. To the world's maxim that 'nothing succeeds like success,' He declares, on the contrary, that nothing fails like success. In His treatment of such cases, perhaps it is not His way now to thrill them into new life with some great and happy spiritual excitement, though He *may* choose that way ; but rather to speak comfortably to them, to deal gently with them, to talk to them of other things, until, almost unknown to themselves, the lameness leaves them.

I have spoken of those who are *born lame*, of those who have been made *lame by accident*, and of those who are lame because they are honestly *tired and broken in spirit*. There is yet another class of lame people in this world. They have become impaled upon a proverb : *there are none so lame as those who will not walk*. That is to say, there are those who are lame *because they are lazy*.

How does Christ deal with these ? They must present to Him the hardest case. For their malady is in the region of the *will* ; and even God cannot, certainly He will not, compel the will. And yet surely there is in Christ something that should make these also get upon their feet and walk. The only hope for a lazy man is that one day he may become ashamed of himself. I verily think there was that, too, in Christ's purpose when He set His face to go to Calvary. I verily believe that He had it in His mind, by dying for man to make us ashamed. Certainly that did happen. I think it is a fair thing to say that the first emotion which swept through the souls of the first disciples the moment they understood things, was a burning shame—shame that they had been talking about their own little affairs as to who should get the best seat at table, and the best office in the new government ; and all the while there was One beside them who saw no course before Him except to give up everything, even life itself. And surely there is still that in Christ which should shame us into protests against ourselves, when we consider

that however we may sink back upon ourselves and humour ourselves in this world, there was One who heard in life a very different call.

Suppose we are all standing on the bank of a river, when suddenly a child falls in and sinks. For an instant we stand there doing nothing. But one of us steps out and plunges into the water to save the child. Suppose he saves the child. Do we not applaud the deed? Does not the most sluggish and indifferent heart rise up to acknowledge an act like that which clothes our human nature with glory? And our applause, if it is genuine, is not mere applause. It is not mere

admiration. It is the confession by every one of us who saw him do the deed, that it was *our* deed. By our very applause we declare that, in the deed, he was our representative and substitute—not to spare us doing the like if the need should ever arise, but to reinforce in ourselves and to create within hearts from which it is absent, the instinct in the presence of a necessity to fling away our dearest thing, even life itself.

The Son of God goes forth to war,
A kingly crown to gain;
His blood-red banner streams afar:
Who follows in His train?

Two Chronological Enigmas in the Old Testament.

BY THE REVEREND T. NICKLIN, HULME HALL, MANCHESTER.

I.

THOSE who have pursued in any measure the study, at first hand, of such intersections as are known to us of the Biblical history and the Assyrian and Babylonian records, are aware that there is one troublesome obstacle in the story of Hezekiah's reign to what is otherwise, through that period, a tolerably simple harmonization. That obstacle is that according to Is 36¹ repeated in 2 K 18¹³ (but not in 2 Ch 32¹): 'It came to pass in the fourteenth year of King Hezekiah, that Sennacherib king of Assyria came up.' In all three narratives this invasion is followed by Hezekiah's illness and Merodach-Baladan's embassy, yet this embassy may in the light of the profane records best be placed about 710 B.C., while Sennacherib's invasion would naturally be about 701.

Further, Hezekiah's reign should begin about 728 B.C., if, as 2 K 18¹⁰ declares, Samaria was captured in his sixth year, and we know that Samaria was captured in 723-2.¹ Various schemes of chronology have been constructed to give coherence to as many as possible of these facts; all involve some violence to some statement or other. Some twelve years ago now, I was led to think of a solution which was subsequently developed in a paper not yet complete for publication. Further

consideration has not made me dissatisfied with this solution, and in the last few weeks what may be some confirmation of its validity unexpectedly presented itself, so that I am impelled at once to lay it before others for examination.

A few words of preparatory elucidation must be given. (1) The three narratives in question—are as critics declare, in reality one narrative with two derivatives, not independent records—are based, we may suppose, on 'the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah.' We do not know the nature of these 'Chronicles,' but on the analogy of those known to us from Nineveh and Babylon, they at any rate conceivably may have been brick-tablets. Whether tablets or not, they were probably of the annalistic type. The tablets we know had catchwords to enable a librarian or a reader to secure a correct sequence if they were disturbed. This catchword method, it is reasonable to suppose, would not be useful only for tablets; at any rate the annalistic dating would supply a sort of thread by which the series of records would be held together, and it must be added that this thread might on occasion mislead a reader if dislocation once took place. (2) Apart from this matter of the form in which were kept the 'Chronicles' on which our three narratives are built, another possibility has been thrown into prominence by discoveries made in the last twenty years. At a still earlier period Mommsen had pointed out that the inadvertent

¹ This has been proved by Dr. Olmstead in his *Western Asia in the Days of Sargon of Assyria*, p. 45, n. 9.

dislocation of the order of certain sheets was the explanation of an extraordinary disturbance of text in the Fourth Book of Cicero's *Letters to Atticus*. Then Schmidt showed incontrovertibly that Mommsen's insight had not erred, and that by counting the lines of text it was easy to see the size of the page in the original MS. which had suffered dislocation and to confirm the conjecture by the ready solution it supplied of all the difficulties in the text. This led me a dozen years ago to write: 'A similar dislocation is undoubtedly responsible for the difficult chronology of Hezekiah's reign. The narrative contained in Isaiah chaps. 36-39 = 2 K 18¹³-20¹⁹ has been disarranged. The true order was Is 38, 39, 36, 37. The 'fourteenth year of King Hezekiah' means, then, 'the fourteenth year in his additional fifteen years of reign after his illness.' This mode of expression by which *the interval after another event is used instead of the regnal year* can be paralleled in the Babylonian records.¹ The probability of dislocation is confirmed by a counting of the lines. Both the English and the Greek texts make chaps. 38 and 39 together equal in length to half of chaps. 36 and 37 together, and so very nearly does the Hebrew.²

This dislocation may have taken place in the authority—*e.g.* brick-tablets with key-words—from which the narrative was compiled. The whole narrative was an appendix at the end of the original text of Isaiah, and if it were written in six columns, two on one piece of material, it would be quite easy, if a separation or dislocation once occurred, for them to be replaced in their present order. The narrative in the *Kings* and in *Chronicles* was perhaps derived from the *Isaiah* chapters after their rearrangement had taken place; or, if the derivation is the other way about, we may notice that the two *Kings* portions are roughly in the proportion of 1:3. Whether this explanation be accepted or not, the interpretation of 'the fourteenth year' may be taken to be correct. Thus we have Hezekiah's accession in 728; his illness in 714, followed by an embassy from Merodach-Baladan; in the fourteenth

¹ See Mr. L. W. King, *The Babylonian King-Lists*, vol. i. chap. 2, where 'in the eleventh year' has been similarly misinterpreted.

² We are not sure as to the exact form of script that Hebrew texts took at this period, and this makes it impossible to insist with meticulous precision on the number of lines covered by the Hebrew text as printed to-day.

year of his second lease of life Sennacherib's invasion, 701; and Hezekiah's death in 699. The correctness of these dates is confirmed by several striking facts. Isaiah in Ahaz's last year delivered a prophecy (Is 28-32), bidding Philistia not to rejoice because the rod that smote her was broken. On the strength of this, attempts have been made to alter entirely the Biblical datings, on the assumption that the allusion was to Shalmaneser's death and Sargon's accession. The reference, it is now clear, will be to Tiglath-pileser's death in 727 soon after Ahaz died. The difficulty of finding a place for Merodach-Baladan's embassy is very great for those who put Hezekiah's accession in 720; with our dating—which, it is to be remembered, is not conjectural but taken direct from the Scripture statements—there is no difficulty.

II.

We now come to the second enigma. In Dn 1¹ we read that 'in the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim king of Judah, came Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon unto Jerusalem and besieged it.' This statement has proved so difficult to correlate with what we otherwise know that Driver, *e.g.*, says, 'Whether this is historically correct is doubtful.' We read in Jer 46² 'the army of Pharaoh-necho . . . in Carchemish . . . Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon smote in the fourth year of Jehoiakim.'³ We know that this battle took place about May 605, and that Nebuchadnezzar was in command as his father's representative, since the king was too infirm to take the field and in fact died about a month later. Again, in Jer 25¹ we have 'the fourth year of Jehoiakim . . . the same was the first year of Nebuchadnezzar.' Further, Jer 25⁹ (from Jehoiakim's fourth year, as has been just said) and 36²⁹ (from his fifth year) speak of a Babylonian attack as still future.

There is no occasion to pursue the chequered mosaics of incident which have been put together to reconcile these statements with *Daniel's* dating. Let us at once proceed to what we are otherwise told of Jehoiakim's reign. Made king by Pharaoh-necho, he became subsequently Nebuchadnezzar's 'servant three years: then he turned and rebelled

³ Driver (*Daniel*, xlix.) was inveigled into doubting the correctness of this synchronism because of its difficulty.

against him. And the Lord sent against him bands of the Chaldeans . . . Jehoiakim slept with his fathers and Jehoiachin reigned . . . three months . . . and the king of Babylon took him in the eighth year of his reign' (2 K 24^{1, 2, 6, 8, 12}). Further, 2 Ch 36^{5-8, 10} says that he reigned eleven years, agreeing in this with 2 K 24¹, and that 'against him came up Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, and bound him in chains to carry him to Babylon. Nebuchadnezzar also carried of the vessels of the house of the Lord to Babylon . . . and Jehoiachin his son reigned in his stead. . . . And at the return of the year' (when, as 2 S 11¹ says, 'kings go out to battle') 'king Nebuchadnezzar sent and brought him to Babylon.'

The reconciliation of all these statements requires a more lengthy discussion than can be given here, and a searching examination of all the dates given in Jeremiah. This must be reserved for another occasion. Here it will be enough to put the matter in this rough way. Jehoiakim came to the throne about 608; his fourth year was about 605; Nebuchadnezzar succeeded his father about the

same time; Jehoiakim died about 597, and the next spring Jehoiachin was taken to Babylon.

Can the date given in Dn 1¹ for the carrying away of the Temple vessels be explained so as to harmonize naturally with the facts, as above stated, of Jehoiakim's reign? There is good reason to claim that, in the light of what has been previously suggested, we are in a position to give what is at least a conceivable solution of the enigma. All would be straightforward if the writer had before him some record which gave some occurrences in Jehoiakim's reign, and, after, mentioned that he submitted to Nebuchadnezzar and served him three years, then revolted, and *in the third year* (after his submission—or, possibly, his revolt—in the reign) of *Jehoiakim* Nebuchadnezzar came up and carried the Temple vessels away, and in the following spring carried Jehoiachin away. We have seen that this form of expression is found in Babylonian records, and that it offers a solution of a difficulty in regard to Hezekiah's reign. That it does the same here may be claimed to confirm the validity of the explanation in both instances.

The Significance for Old Testament History of a New Tablet.

BY PROFESSOR THE REVEREND A. C. WELCH, D.D., EDINBURGH.

MR. GADD, assistant in the department of Egyptian and Assyrian antiquities at the British Museum, has had the singular good fortune to discover a new tablet. And, by order of the Trustees, there has recently been published a volume, in which the discoverer gives a transliteration and translation of the text with notes. The document contains the Babylonian Chronicle between the years 616-609, which are the tenth to the seventeenth years of Nabopolassar, who was the founder of the New-Babylonian or Chaldean monarchy. It relates the series of campaigns carried out by the Babylonians, allied with the Medes and Scythians, against Assyria, the issue of which was that Nineveh, after a two months' siege, fell never to rise again. The tablet further recounts a last stand of the defeated Assyrians at Harran, which was brought to a speedy end by the Scythians

capturing the new capital. Unfortunately, however, it ends without mention of the battle of Carchemish, where Babylonia, after its conquest of Assyria, met and defeated the Egyptians.

The period, since it contains a turning-point in the history of the Euphrates valley, is of great importance, but has hitherto been very obscure. Our knowledge of it was derived from later documents and from indirect sources of information. This first-hand, contemporary document throws a welcome beam of light into the darkness. Students of the history of the farther East will need to relate its new facts to the accounts of Josephus, Herodotus, and others. Here it is only proposed to point out its significance for Old Testament study.

Certainly, then, the date of the fall of Nineveh has been decided. Hitherto the accepted date has been 606. The great city was actually cap-

tured in 612, six years earlier. It is a natural inference, but no more, that the date of the battle of Carchemish must also be moved back some years. Unfortunately this is not certain, for, as has been said, the tablet breaks off before that decisive battle. It is also now clear that Assyria did not come to a final end with the capture of its capital. Part of the army escaped to Harran, and there Ashur-uballit tried to rally the fragments of the people. His kingdom, however, was short-lived, for the Scythians captured the new capital in 610.

The fact that Assyria managed to survive for two more years after the fall of Nineveh is of interest to students of world-history, but carries little significance for knowledge of the Old Testament conditions. Assyria ceased to count in Palestinian affairs, when Nineveh fell. What is of significance there is the remarkable information that an Egyptian army came to the help of the Assyrians at Harran. In an earlier year, also, 616, Egyptian help enabled Nineveh to beat back a dangerous attack by the Babylonians, when they were advancing up the Tigris. That is to say, in these last critical years of the Assyrian empire, Nineveh and Egypt were allies against Babylonia. Now 2 K 23²⁹, in its account of Josiah's end at Megiddo, states that Pharaoh-Necho was marching against the Assyrians. Josephus, x. 5. 1, on the other hand, names as the enemies of Egypt the Medes and Babylonians. Evidently the new tablet proves Josephus to be in the right. The Pharaoh had taken alarm at this coalition which was overwhelming his ally, or, if Egypt was subject to Assyria, was sending a contingent to the help of his suzerain.

But the new fact of an alliance between Egypt and Assyria, which extended over several years, compels us to reconsider the relations between Pharaoh-Necho and Josiah of Jerusalem. What happened, when the Judean king was put to death at Megiddo? Was there a battle on that famous road by which the Egyptian army must advance to the Euphrates? If there was, why was Josiah opposing Egypt? Josiah was certainly tributary to Assyria at the time. If then he opposed the Egyptians, he was fighting against an army which was hastening to retrieve the disaster which had befallen his liege lord.

So long as it was believed that Egypt was hostile to Nineveh and that in the battle at Carchemish it was merely seeking its share of spoils in the East,

those who held that a great fight took place at Megiddo maintained that Josiah, in loyalty to his suzerain at Nineveh, flung himself across the path of Pharaoh-Necho in a vain, but gallant, effort to stop the invaders. Now that it has been made clear that Egypt was in alliance with Assyria, this explanation of the attitude of the king and of the whole situation is no longer tenable. Josiah, if he was a loyal tributary, could not be resisting an army which was hurrying to save the remnants of Assyria.

If the events at Megiddo took place between the final ruin of the Assyrians at Harran and the battle at Carchemish, where the Pharaoh tried conclusions with the Babylonians, the new Chronicle reveals a different situation. By the fall of Harran Pharaoh-Necho had been flung back into Syria. Only a contingent of his army, however, may have been involved in the final collapse of the new Assyrian capital. He was not prepared to acknowledge himself beaten and so leave all Syria open to Babylonian influence. Before advancing afresh, he felt it necessary to secure his rear, and especially to make sure that Judah did not rise behind him. Jerusalem was small enough to be negligible in ordinary circumstances. But even the little State of Judah might form an ugly neighbour, if, after a defeat on the Euphrates, an Egyptian army were forced to retire in something like rout along the road of the Philistine plain. The Pharaoh may even have had reason to suspect that Josiah had been tampered with by emissaries from Babylon, as Hezekiah had been tampered with at an earlier date. He summoned Josiah to his presence in the North and had him put to death.

When the situation is thus recognized, it brings the further suggestion as to whether there was ever a battle between Josiah and Necho at Megiddo at all. Was there anything more than a military court-martial and execution? As soon as the Old Testament accounts are examined in the light of the new situation which the tablet has revealed, it becomes significant to notice that in 2 K 23^{29ff.} there is no mention of a battle. 'King Josiah went up to meet Pharaoh-Necho, and he slew him at Megiddo when he had seen him.' That hardly reads like the description of a pitched battle between two nations. And what follows only confirms the impression thus gained. For the king's servants quietly bring the body of their dead master back to Jerusalem, and the people of Judah proceed to appoint a successor. This successor,

Jehoahaz, was not found acceptable to the Egyptian king, who removed him also, and set up a nominee of his own, the Jehoiakim who treated Jeremiah so cavalierly. The impression left by the whole account is that the Pharaoh was making sure of the little kingdom at his back, and was able to do it with extreme ease.

It is the Chronicler, in 2 Ch 35^{20ff.}, who is responsible for the view that a battle was fought at Megiddo. Some will be able easily to dispose of his evidence, as of a like unreliable character with all that he relates. Personally I am not able to believe that a man, who wrote a serious history at a time which was not very distantly removed from the period of Josiah, invented a story and put it in circulation. And it is interesting to notice that in v.²¹ he writes in his own way of certain negotiations between Necho and Josiah. That seems to point in the direction of the Pharaoh

having reason to suspect Josiah's loyalty to Assyria and its ally, and of his having made some sincere effort to bring Judah back peaceably. And, as for the account of the fight, which shows such interesting evidence of having been written up on the model of Ahab's final defeat, it may be no more than a somewhat grandiose description of a scuffle which took place between Josiah's escort and the Egyptians, when he met the Pharaoh finally at Megiddo.

But, whatever one may think of Megiddo and the events which took place there, it remains certain that Josiah was not prompted in his action by loyalty to his suzerain at Nineveh. Whether he was defeated at Megiddo in a pitched battle, or was merely executed after a drumhead court-martial, his death was due to the fact that he was not supporting Assyria. For Necho who put him to death was Nineveh's ally.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

What a Boy gave God.¹

'And Jesus sat over against the treasury, and beheld how the people cast money into the treasury: and many that were rich cast in much. And there came a certain poor widow, and she threw in two mites, which make a farthing. And he called unto him his disciples, and saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, That this poor widow hath cast more in, than all they which have cast into the treasury: for all they did cast in of their abundance; but she of her want did cast in all that she had, even all her living.'—Mk 12⁴¹⁻⁴⁴.

WHAT'S your name? Well, you say, I'm really Margaret, and strangers call me that; but Mother says I'm Meg, and the wee ones shout for Peggie, and at school, to tease me, they say, Hallo, Maggie! I see. So Margaret and Maggie and Meg and Peggie all mean the same thing, mean you. Well, in the very same way there are people who call their church a church, but others say theirs is a chapel, and others 'but mine's a cathedral,' and long ago the Greeks called theirs, a temple. But they all mean the same thing. A temple was just a church where people went to worship God. Not very long

ago—oh yes, it was before you were born—they found an old Greek temple that had been buried underneath the ground for hundreds and hundreds of years. It was a church where long ago people had gone to worship a god whom they called Apollo. And it seems that all the sick folk in the country round about, people like that old body Mother goes to see on Sundays, or that boy who hurt himself at football and has been in bed for weeks and weeks, all that kind of folk were carried up to the temple, and prayed to the god to make them better, and often they were cured.

God, of course, really gives for nothing. He's not like you, who would only give your knife with the three blades if you got an electric torch in exchange. He gives for nothing. He's not like people who won't let you in unless you pay. You remember when that big match was on, and like a silly you had spent your money upon sweets and hadn't enough left to get you in, and you could hear the shouts and cheers and wanted so to see but couldn't, for you had no money, and they were charging at the gates. God's not like that; He gives just as a present, like Father or like Mother. Wouldn't it be dreadful if you had to pay *them*—

¹ By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

to pay for your bed and couldn't go to it however tired and sleepy you might be till you had given them your sixpence, and no breakfast till you laid down something more, no dinner till you had cleaned out your pockets or found your purse and doled out your last pennies. And you would be so hungry before bedtime, and what then? But Father gives for nothing, just for love, and so does God; He also gives for nothing, just for love. But the old Greeks didn't know that; they thought they had to pay Apollo before he would heal them. And so these sick folk promised wonderful things: houses, lands, pictures—the rich, money, heaps of it; the poor, less; the poorest, very little, and yet all they had; some brought statues, some ships, some books, all kinds of things. At least they asked for a votive tablet, that is a bit of wax, and wrote on it what they would give. 'If Apollo heals me I will give him all my ships' one man would write, and the priest took it and hung it up before the altar; and if the man got well, by and by he wrote across it, 'Gift accepted, prayer answered,' and left it there for every one to see. I want to tell you about one tablet like that that they have found. There was a little lad, yes, quite as young as you; yes, I think he was even younger. Anyway, he was a cripple, and he was so tired of it. All through the long, long summer days he heard the other fellows laughing outside at their games: the very birds could hop about on his window-sill, the very flies could climb up the walls, but he had to lie there quite still. And at last he got his people to carry him up to the temple. But they were very poor, and they had nothing to give Apollo. The little man lay there and watched, he saw how others promised houses and splendid things of one kind and another. And what could he give? He thought and he thought, and at last he remembered and made up his mind, asked for one of the tablets and wrote on it in his boy's big, sprawling hand, 'If Apollo heals me I will give him'—what do you think?—'I will give him—twelve marbles.' Well, he got better, and by and by the priest wrote across that tablet where it hung among the others, 'Gift accepted, prayer answered,' and left it there for all to see.

Now you think you have nothing you could give God; and yet because He is so loving and kind you wish you had something that you could bring Him. It's like Mother's birthday present. It takes a bit of saving, doesn't it, and a dreadfully long

time, and often you half wish you hadn't begun, for it's going to be a very little present after all. Yet, when the day comes, you're so glad you did it; for Mother is so pleased and proud about it. It isn't really very well sewn, but then *you* sewed it, and Mother loves it even though the lines wobble a bit. It isn't much of a painting, but she doesn't seem to notice the smudge up in the corner, thinks it very fine indeed. And have you really nothing you could give to God? Think now, like that wee man who came at last on his twelve marbles! Have you any pocket-money: I hadn't when I was wee—used to save up off the lunch penny for Christmas, and found it hungry work. But if you have any, couldn't you spare some of it to let the brown and the black and the yellow and the red boys and girls who never heard of Jesus get to have a share in Him? If they knew Him, they too would love to take His hand and make a friend of Him. And wouldn't you rather like that their mummies too should tell them all those splendid stories they have never heard, about David and Jonathan—don't you like Jonathan, and Joseph and the coat?—but best of all about Jesus Christ? Couldn't you spare something for God, though you have dreadfully little for yourself? Well then the next time they are taking the collection in church—isn't it dreadfully exciting. You quite forget which pocket you put yours in, try this one and that one, no; it will be the inside pocket; no, it isn't; and the man is getting nearer and nearer with his bag; wherever can it be? You take out everything from your hankie downwards, but still you can't find it. Oh yes, here it is in my hand, I remember I was going to hold it, that I might know where it was! And in your relief you open your hand to look at it, and down it falls with such a noise and rolls quite a long way, and you get purple in the face before you find it! Or else it sticks so fast to your hot hand, that you have to shake and shake before it goes into the bag, and the man is kept there waiting. Well, the next time remember you are not just putting it in a wee bag. No, you are putting it into God's hand, and you are looking up into His face, and with a happy little wriggle you are saying to Him, 'This is for *You* from *Me*.'

Or have you no toys or books that you could spare for little children who have none, not one? And you've so many. Why, you've forgotten about half of them. When did you play with your railway last? And when did you see your jumping

rabbit Gustavus Adolphus? You've never looked at him since that day the cat thought he was real, and caught and chewed him. Why, you've heaps and heaps; and there are children who have none. Couldn't you spare a few? Oh yes, if you like, the engine that wont go, and the aeroplane that doesn't fly now. That's better than nothing, and they'll love even these. But remember you are going to put it into God's hand, and look up in His face and say, 'This is for *You* from *Me*.' Wouldn't you like to give a better one to Him?

Or best of all, there's your own little heart. He'll like that far the most. It isn't a big heart, it isn't grown up like Daddy's, it's quite wee, and it's rather quarrelsome sometimes, isn't it, and a bit selfish now and then? And yet Apollo liked the marbles just as much as the big gifts from the big folk. And if you give your heart, put it into God's hand, and look up in His face, and say, 'This is for *You* from *Me*,' He'll just love that.

Boobies.¹

'Deceiving your own selves.'—Ja 1²².

When you want to tell any one not to be silly you say, 'Don't be an ass,' and at that the ass twitches its ears and doesn't mind; or 'Don't be a donkey,' and the donkey with a thistle hanging half out of its mouth thinks to itself, 'Why ever not? it's a fine thing to be'; or 'Don't be a mule,' and the mule pretends he hasn't heard, and yet take care and keep well clear of his legs or he will brain you; or 'Don't be a goose,' and the goose grows quite ratty. 'Look here,' it says, 'who are you calling names at!' gabbles and hisses and gets angry and excited over it. And yet if you must call people anything, the thing to say is 'Don't be a penguin.' For surely the penguin is about the silliest and stupidest and dullest of all creatures. Oh, it has got its points! When the ice is melting and bits are breaking off and being carried away by the current, the penguins crowd upon them, as many as each bit will hold, and go off for a joy ride as far as they dare, and then come back and scramble on another piece and off again, over and over. And that's good sense enough. And indeed they are delightful creatures, quaint and likeable and really clever in some ways, but in others just dreadfully stupid. People have told us they have seen them sitting on round little bits of ice, sitting

on them for days and weeks, sitting on them because they thought that they were eggs, and their own eggs at that! And they never found out their mistake, it seems; were always sure that, if they sat long enough, the little penguins would come out at last! Others got their families hatched, and yet with them nothing happened. Very strange, they thought, and turned and had a look. 'Yes, they are first-rate eggs,' they said, and sat on for a few days more. Other penguins, with their families growing up by now, passed by and stopped to say, 'Aren't you a little late this year?' 'Slow but sure is *my* motto,' said the penguins on the bits of ice; 'there is far too much rush and bustle these days, for *my* taste. What's all the hurry?' Some more days, and the other penguins spoke again. 'Look here,' was all the answer that they got, 'I once had a friend who had an uncle who knew a penguin who had heard of places where it is quite hot; and he said that there there were things that grow up in a night and wither almost at once, and other things that grow up very slowly, but then they last and live ever so long. These chicks of yours are common penguins, but evidently mine are going to be something worth the having, slow perhaps in coming, but, mark you, worth the having when they do come. Look at the eggs.' And with that they all crowded round and looked and had a dab or two at them and agreed they were first-class eggs, and nothing could be wrong. Yet they were only bits of ice! Well, there are fellows in your class who aren't exactly bright, and you may be among them! They never will know what verbs take the dative, and what prepositions have the ablative; they can't spell, always 'piece' is 'peice,' and always 'receive' is 'recieve,' and though they can bicycle with both hands off the bars and both feet off the pedals, they can't get it right on paper. No, they're not brilliant. But a bird that doesn't know the difference between its own eggs and lumps of ice is just about the frozen limit!

And yet I don't know: these mother penguins want wee penguins, and they're quite right; and there are boys and girls who want to be happy, and they're quite right too. What's wrong with the penguins is that they think they can get them out of bits of ice; and what's wrong with you is that you think you can get happiness out of just impossible things.

Some of you have a daft idea that the way to have a jolly time is to kick over the traces. If there are rules, we will just break them, that's

¹ By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

where the fun comes in ; if there is work to do, well, we won't do it, that's the kind of chaps we are. Why should we ? We're out to have our fling. And the way to be happy is to do what you like. No it isn't. And though you try and try, you'll never find it that way. They may sit till they freeze, these penguins, but they will never hatch their youngsters out of ice. And you'll never come on happiness that road you're taking. Your scheme won't work, it never really comes off, and it never will. And some of us have found that out. We thought it was so clever to sit up late and have a racket that night that Dad and Mother were out, though we knew they were trusting us. And at the time it did seem quite good sport, that pillow-fight and all the rest of it. But afterwards in bed we felt so mean and horrid that we just had to own up, felt beastly till we did. That evening we skipped lessons and chanced things, it was all right until next day, but the licking stung a lot, and those hundreds of lines we got to write took the shine out of things, and made us feel a little silly, slaving away there, with the others having a good time out in the sunshine. That time we rather funked at football, didn't get down to the ball because the other fellows were so big and rough and hefty ; nobody knew ; all that they said was that we weren't as nippy on the ball as usual ; but we knew, and we just despised ourselves. No, you will never get birds out of ice however solemnly you sit on it, and you'll never really be happy till you play the game and go straight all the time. And if you think you can, look at these penguins, silly brutes ! Don't you feel you would like to shy something at them sitting there day after day, the idiots. And you ? Why, a donkey's a philosopher compared to you, and a goose is a sheer genius. Don't be a penguin, and expect things that can't happen. Chicks can't come out of ice nor happiness from playing the fool.

Nor will you manage any better, ever really be happy, by being soft and weak and cowardly. Sometimes that looks as if it were the line to take if you don't want to have a roughish time, or to be laughed at. And it hurts to be laughed at, hurts worse and nippier than a licking. And so you do what the others do, though you think it rather mean and silly ; and fall into line with what isn't quite straight because all the rest are keen on it, and you would catch it if you didn't. 'I must,' you say, 'if I'm to have a time of it at all, you don't

know what it means to be alone and laughed at, with all the other fellows thinking you a coward because you don't do what they do, don't make a row because they want to make one.' Well, really, I wouldn't have believed it ! A penguin sitting on ice and expecting to hatch babies is fairly dotty, I think. But you're far worse. You ought to stand up and let us see you. You're worth looking at. To think that the way to be happy is to be led by the nose, to be a bit of putty that any one can squeeze into any shape he wants. Don't you know you'll never be happy unless you keep chummy with some one called your conscience. You may break with all the rest. But you must keep in with him. Every baby in the nursery knows that, as every bird except a penguin knows that you must sit on eggs. But you don't, so it seems ; don't know that till you stand up on your own feet, and do what you know to be right whatever comes of it, you can't be happy, and you never will. As Brutus said, and you ought to like him for killing Cæsar—if only he had done it sooner there would have been no Cæsar to get up—the hardest lesson of all is not Latin or Greek or grammar or maths, it's to say 'No,' and no one is educated till he can.

And yet again, there are some fellows who think happiness lies in the land of selfishness, and they set out to find it there. Now isn't that enough to make even a penguin laugh ? They aren't just bright themselves, but they know better than that at least. And I believe that what keeps them sitting cheerily all these months is that they've heard of boys and girls who expect to hatch happiness from selfishness. Of course they don't believe the yarn. No one, they know, could possibly be such an idiot as that. But it's a good joke, and they keep chuckling over it. 'The silly fools,' they say. 'Fancy expecting happiness out of selfishness !' Just as you say, 'Fancy expecting penguins out of bits of ice !' No, you'll not get it that way. Their Chief tells the Scouts that ; bids them do a kind action every day ; not just as a horrid thing to be gulped down like the bitter medicine after breakfast, and then, hurrah, that's over, and now I'll think only of myself and what I want, and what I like. No, but because if you're kind, and unselfish once a day, you'll feel so happy over it that you'll want to be kind and unselfish all the day. And he's quite right. Jesus Christ told us that long, long ago, and Jesus Christ knew, because no one ever was so happy as He was ; and

He wants to share it with us. I am come to make you glad and joyous like Me, He once said—no more gloomy faces, no more dull, long days, no more grumpiness and 'What'll I do now?'; but good cheer always. Yes, and He tells us how to manage it.

Listen, and I'll put it into your own language for you, though it's Christ who is speaking. Look here, you fellows, it's a sound scheme to want to be happy. But you're off the road, are facing the wrong way. I'll show you how to reach it. Here are eight sign-posts that will take you straight to it. If you want to be happy, don't put on side; if you want to be happy, feel for the other fellow if he's in a hole as if you were right in yourself, and try to help him out of it; if you want to be happy, don't think you know everything but be willing to be taught; if you want to be happy, keep trying to be manlier and better than you are; if you want to be happy, be kind; if you want to be happy, be clean; if you want to be happy, never get ratty and no quarrelling; if you want to be happy, then when it's not easy to do right, do it like a man and face the music. Can you find that in the Bible? It's all there, and it was Christ who said it, and Christ knows. Look at the start of Matthew, chapter five. But you! Well I would have said the penguin sitting upon ice was much the stupidest creature. But there's one still worse, it seems. Come and I'll show it you. Upstairs, into your room, stand in the middle of the floor, turn towards the window. Now open your eyes. But, you say, I'm looking at the mirror, and that's me. Quite so; that's you, that's what I wanted you to see. Sitting for weeks on lumps of ice is bad enough. But trying to get happiness from selfishness! Did anybody ever hear the like of that? I wouldn't tell if I were you. They would never stop laughing at you, if they knew. Penguins from lumps of ice? Perhaps, though it's not very likely. But happiness from being selfish? Never, never, never, never.

The Christian Year.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Affections.

'Finally, be ye all likeminded, compassionate, loving as brethren.'—1 P 3⁸.

'Be kindly affectioned one to another in brotherly love.'—Ro 12¹⁰.

The old Stoic ideal was that which we can only express by the ugly word 'impassivity,' the state

in which a man by the power of reason rises above all feeling; the cold, passionless state in which anger and pity are alike regarded as weakness. And the Nirvana of the Buddhist is, above all, the extinction of desire. Very different is the ideal of the Christian. The affections are God-given, like all parts of our nature, and therefore not to be suppressed, trampled underfoot, but to be consecrated to Him Who gave them; and in Whose Perfect Being (just because they proceed from Him) there must exist some high attributes of which these are the reflexion. But we are not limited to any *a priori* theorizing on this subject. In the Son of Man the life of the affections was not less, but infinitely richer and fuller, than in ourselves. We think of Him Who was touched with pity for the little children and, rebuking His disciples, took them up in His arms and blessed them; Who was moved with indignation at the conduct of those who, for sake of a ritual scruple, would have hindered a work of humanity; Who wept by the grave of His friend; Who loved one of His disciples with the love of friendship.¹

But can affections be commanded? It would seem so. Here in the texts the imperative command enters the secret sanctuary of feeling. It is not concerned with external acts: it is concerned with internal disposition. It is not primarily a service which is commanded, but a feeling. But can feelings be made to order? Charity can: can pity? Labour can: can love? 'Be kindly affectioned one to another.' 'Be pitiful.' The order is clear and imperative; can I obey it? Authority commands me to be pitiful: then can pity be created by an immediate personal fiat? Can a man say to himself, 'Go to; this day I will array myself in love, and I will distribute influences of sweet and pure affection! I will unseal my springs of pity, and the gentle waters shall flow softly through all my common affairs'? Such mechanized affection would have no vitality, and such pity would be merely theatrical—of no more reality of efficacy than the acted pity of the stage.

But what we cannot create by a fiat, we may produce by a process. Pity, love, are the culmination of a process; they are not stamped as with a die, they are grown as a fruit.

The obligation therefore centres round about the process; the issues belong to the Lord. Ours is the planting, ours the watering, ours the tending;

¹ J. H. Beibitz, *Jesus Salvator Mundi*, 112.

God giveth the increase. When, therefore, we hear the apostolic imperative, 'Be loving,' we do not think of a stage, we think of a garden; we do not think of a manufactory, we think of a school.

What can be done? If we would have fine issues, we must have rare character. Is it possible to go into the roots and springs of character, into the primary spiritual substance which lies behind thought and feeling, and change the organic quality of the soul? If this can be done, the creation of love and pity is assured! If the coarse fibres of the soul can be transformed into delicate harp-strings, we shall soon have the sweet and responsive music of sympathy and affection! Can it be done? Why, this transformation is the very glory of the Christian evangel!

'He sits as a refiner.' And what is the purpose of the Refiner? Let the Apostle Paul supply the answer, 'We are renewed by His Spirit in the inner man.'

1. The conditions of obtaining refinement are found in communion. 'His Spirit in the inner man': it is *fellowship between man and his Maker*; it is the companionship of the soul and God. All lofty communion is refining! What, then, must be the transforming influence of the companionship of the Highest? We can see its ministry in the lives of the saints. If we lay our hand upon any one, man or woman, who walks in closest fellowship with the risen Lord, we find that the texture of their life is as the choicest porcelain, compared with which all irreligious lives are as coarse and common clay. By communion with the Divine we become 'partakers of the Divine nature.'

2. The second step in the process is that *refined faculties must be exercised*. The refined spirit must be exercised in the ministry of a large discernment. There is no faculty which is more persistently denied its proper work than the power of the imagination. 'Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others.' Such vision calls for the exercise of the imagination. Imagination is the eye which sees the unseen. Imagination does for the absent what the eye does for the present. Imagination does for the distant what the eye does for the near. The eye is concerned with surfaces; imagination is busied with depths. The dominion of eye terminates at the horizon; at the horizon, imagination begins. Imagination is the faculty of realization; it takes a surface, and constructs a cube; it takes statistics, and fashions a life.

3. When refined imagination works, love and pity awake. And if they are not to be smothered again, the aroused impulses must be gratified and fed. Feelings of pity, which do not receive fulfilment in charity or service, may become ministers of petrification. Let our piety be the basis of our pity; let our imagination extend our vision; and from this area of hallowed outlook there will arise rivers of gracious sympathy, abundantly succouring the children of pain and grief.¹

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Changing Label.²

BY THE REV. HUBERT L. SIMPSON.

'He shall call his servants by another name: so that he who blesseth himself in the earth shall bless himself in the God of truth.'—Is 65¹⁵, 16.

This chapter closes with the well-known picture of the time when all things shall be at last restored, when the wolf shall lie down with the lamb. 'They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord.' It will be like living in a new creation, and the former nightmare shall no longer sit heavy upon the mind and heart of distraught humanity.

But the prophet knows that we have still a long way to go before so desirable a goal will be reached. The opening verses of the chapter deal with things which are still exercising our thoughts, and perhaps puzzling our minds. There is, on the one hand, the ever-present fact of so much unlabelled goodness—unconscious Christianity as we would call it to-day. 'I am inquired of by them that asked not for me; I am found of them that sought me not.' We are perpetually being alternately cheered and challenged by that paradox, until we sometimes wonder whether labels have any value at all, and the foot-rule of orthodoxy seems altogether too inadequate a reed wherewith to measure the city of God. And, on the other hand, we too are confronted, as the prophet was, by the problem of devouring wolves wearing the livery of Heaven, and of all manner of unrighteousness practised in the sacred name of religion, 'a people that provoketh me to my face continually.' They are experts in the religion, not of the bowed down heart, but of the upturned nose; 'which say, Stand by thyself, come not near to me, for I am holier than

¹ J. H. Jowett, *The Epistles of St. Peter*, 115.

² *Put Forth by the Moon*, 198 ff.

thou.' That, says the prophet, in the daring imagery which is begotten of a close and constant walk with the God of truth, is the kind of thing which chokes the very nostrils through which a living God draws the breath of being.

There appear upon the stage of the prophet's vision not a few of the types whose activities hinder the onward sweep of truth to-day. There are those who turn away from the ordinances of the house of God that they may gamble upon the spin of a top or the fall of dice; and there are those who dabble in the occult. And by way of contrast to those heated salons of sin wherein the soul of a city is stifled, he makes God glad to go forth into the quiet country places where the grape-gatherers are gleaning their purple harvest; and into the lips of a grateful God, who has turned from mildewed sins to simple sincerities, he makes bold to put the words of a harvester's song, a snatch redolent of provençal mirth and innocent gaiety. . . . But the prophet has a deeper note to strike. It is not enough that Society has its salt as well as its corruption. If the gulf between things as they are to-day and the vision for whose fulfilment we look to-morrow is to be speedily bridged it must be through a perpetual vigilance, and a continual adaptation of conventionality to reality, on the part of those who are the professing servants of God. The one essential in spiritual things, and in religious expressions of them, is truth in the inward part. Reality must be achieved at all costs.

Among the combatants in the late war it was necessary to keep changing the ciphers and the code names from time to time, because there was always the risk that the enemy might have got a hold of them and would use them to mislead and to destroy. The great C.O., says the prophet, knows the importance of perpetually changing the passwords into His presence, of reminting the coinage of spiritual commerce, of reorganizing and remanning the battalions of righteousness. If communication between the fighters in the front line and H.Q. is to be kept up untapped and untampered with by a ceaselessly vigilant foe, there is need that we should ever be examining ourselves to see whether we be in the faith.

This is what the prophet means by saying that God 'shall call his servants by another name: so that he who blesseth himself in the earth shall bless himself in the God of truth.' If contact with God is to be a real and vital and ever-fresh experience,

each generation, and often each individual in his generation, may have to keep changing the form or the manner of his approach. It is vital for true religion, the prophet says, that those who pray here upon earth should pray to a God of truth, that is to say, a God who is true for them—intellectually true, morally true, spiritually true. And that may mean that we shall have to change some of our ways of speaking about God and about sacred things. There are, in Christian churches, multitudes of idolaters—people, that is to say, who insist on bowing down to things which may once have represented God, but are to-day taking the place of God. Idolatry consists in bowing down to unrealities of any kind, whether they be creations of the hands or figments of the intellect. . . . The God who desires truth in the inward parts from those who would approach His presence, surely desires it most of all in our thought and in our language about Him and His ways. 'He shall call his servants by another name.' They are still His servants although their old familiar name has been changed. The only thing that matters is 'that he who blesseth himself in the earth shall bless himself in the God of truth.' 'Truth in the inward parts' is the first gift of Almighty God to the soul turning again to seek His face. Later on He will enable such an one in the hidden part to know that wisdom which girds truth with tenderness and beauty.

'It is very hard to be a good Christian.' It is so much easier to be merely an orthodox one. It is easy enough to appear reverent in outward form: it is hard to be reverent in deed and in truth. They seemed a highly reverent, respectable majority who appeared to be so terribly shocked at the bare idea of destroying the Temple. 'This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place, and the law: for we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered unto us.' It was really shocking; the thing was intolerable! It is always confusing and perturbing to lazy natures to have names perpetually changing. It was never easy to bless oneself in the God of truth. It was always so much more convenient to deal with the God of convention. . . .

'He shall call his servants by another name.' I don't suppose that Daniel and his companions greatly relished having their names changed in

Babylon. They were the names they had received from their fathers, the names by which they had been called from childhood by their mothers, names that breathed religious conviction and whose very sound was holy. But they were still God's servants when people of a strange speech were calling them Belteshazzar, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. The one thing that mattered was that they were keeping up a vital contact with the God of heaven, to whom they prayed three times a day, and so were made strong to walk in the midst of the fiery furnace and to endure in the den of lions.

These are not easy times in which we are living, for those who are joined to the past by tender and holy ties and many gracious memories. I suppose there are many who thought at one time that their whole philosophy of life would go if a day should ever come when the theology of the *Shorter Catechism* or Prayer Book and any syllable of Holy Writ ceased in the smallest detail of expression to represent for them essential and unalterable truth. But for their peace of mind they have long since been glad to recognize that their eternal salvation depends neither upon the 'credibility of Judges nor the edibility of Jonah.' Names and forms and customs may and must change, but the God of truth—the Amen God, as the Hebrew has it—remains unchanged. We can recognize His servants when they appear, even though some of them wear unfamiliar garments and bear new names. Whatsoever is of the truth is the servant of God. As Marcus Dods used to say, 'The man who refuses to face facts doesn't believe in God.' . . .

In the midst of the confusion and overthrow of which we all are conscious to-day, for those who have a living faith in the unchanging Christ, there should be nothing but exultation and a lifting up of the head to behold the coming of better and greater things. Nothing can suffer destruction save that which is done and ready to pass away. It will all be gain if faith pass from a matter of empty forms and half-believed dogmas to a living and energizing knowledge of, and life in, the eternal Son of God. The future belongs to clear thinking and scrupulous honesty of the intellect. An old Quaker used to repeat over and over again, 'Get an experience. Get an experience.' It was his way of emphasizing the 'importance of individual gleanings from life.' One experimentally proved belief is of more value to the individual soul, and through him to the Church, than a book of pro-

fessed creed. Most of us probably believe rather less than we did when we set out upon the life of faith. Gradually, slowly, even sorrowfully perhaps, we find our beliefs getting fewer, but the faith that remains grows deeper, and means more, as the years go on. . . . There will be general recognition of the fact that there can be no orthodoxy but truth; that it is infinitely more important that an expression of faith should be intensive than that it should be extensive; that the paramount question is, not, What creed do you hold? but only, What creed holds you? By many another name may God's servants be called ere the Kingdom comes. But come it will when he who blesseth himself in the earth shall bless himself in the God of truth; and he who dedicates himself to the service of God and man in the earth shall swear his high vow by the God of truth.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Untroubled Heart.

'Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you. . . . Let not your heart be troubled.'—Jn 14²⁷.

The word 'Peace' falls on our ears to-day with the sound of far-off music. We are living through a time of so many disillusionments, that hopefulness has almost become the kind of thing of which a good man is half ashamed. But there is one thing that we can be sure of, and that is that if the secret of peace is to be found, it is Christ alone who has the real prescription. The key to peace is in His hands—the peace of the heart and the peace of the world. 'Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you. . . . Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid.'

Now what is the nature of this peace of Christ? He describes it as 'My peace . . . not as the world giveth.' What, then, is His peace?

1. *Christ's peace is harmony with God.* True peace is the harmony between our nature and our environment. Unrest comes from a clash between a man's nature and the world in which he lives. But here is the point. Our true environment is spiritual. If there is conflict in our souls, it is because we have chosen to live in a narrow world in which there is no room for our souls to find freedom. Track down the unrest of our time, whether it shows itself in classes or in individuals, and you find friction between the souls of men and the nature of things, which is the will of God. This

unrest may show itself in various ways. It may appear in a constant strain, in the jarring machinery of industry, in hollow dissatisfaction which keeps us ever seeking and never finding—in restless activities which wear us out and achieve nothing. Many people are like a clock which has lost its pendulum. You wind it up and off it goes at a furious pace of whirring wheels which is soon finished and played out. But attach the pendulum and the result is a movement which is peace—stable, restful, calm, purposeful. What has happened? The law of gravitation has come into play—the law which rules the resistless tides of ocean, and guides the majestic stars in their courses. The little clock with its feverish heart has been taken up into that mighty movement and there is peace. That is what our lives need. They need to be linked on to God. There is inner conflict, because the deepest and most vital instinct of our nature is being repressed—the instinct for the Divine. There was no shadow between Christ and God. There was perfect understanding between Him and His Father, and where there are no shadows between a man and God, no earthly troubles can break this deep and final peace of the spirit, and out of that peace comes power to meet whatever life may bring. It is this peace He offers to us all, the peace of a heart at rest in God. ‘Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you.’ The harmony of Christ with God showed itself in a Divine valuation of life, which puts things in their true perspective. That valuation set Christ beyond the reach of many of the things which trouble us. Loss of property, for instance, did not trouble Him, or the fear of it, for He set no store by money for its own sake. The scorn of men or the withdrawal of their esteem did not trouble Him, for He set no value on the smile of popular favour. It is a wrong valuation of the good of life, which creates much of our unrest and lays us open to the torment of fear. The world will only be set right by men who value principles above possessions, who are detached enough from the treasure of earth to be undeterred from righteousness by the pistol-point of life’s ills. What care we give ourselves by pinning our life’s success to the little things instead of the big things, to the accident instead of the essentials! The great Dr. Chalmers made a speech to the Assembly of the Church of Scotland about ministerial training, in which he gave the story of his own changed mind. He had been a distin-

guished student of mathematics in his day; but that was poor preparation for a preacher of the gospel. ‘Strangely blinded was I,’ he said. ‘What is the object of mathematical science? Magnitude and the proportion of magnitude. But then, sir, I had forgotten two magnitudes, the littleness of time and the greatness of eternity.’ It is the eternal values which make life great, and fill it with joy and satisfaction.

2. *Christ’s peace means a right attitude to men.*

If a man is really one with God, that harmony will make itself felt in a right attitude to men. Much of our dispeace comes from a wrong attitude to others. The dark heart of the world’s unrest to-day is full of such things as hatred, suspicion, jealousy, spite, contempt of man for man. These are the ingredients of the devil’s cauldron which brews the deadly spirit. There is no peace in any heart till it is emptied of these or lifted above their reach.

It is not a pleasant thing to be hated, but the dispeace comes when that hatred is allowed to stir the dust of our own passions. We lose our peace—not when others hate us, if there is no lurking suspicion that it has been deserved; we lose our peace when we hate others.

Part of the secret of peace is a loving attitude towards others. ‘Fret not thyself about evil-doers,’ says the Psalmist. Do not let the wrongs of others overthrow the balance of your own soul. Say the worst you can about the things men do, there is always something about a man, if we could see him with the eyes of Christ, which would draw tears of compassion instead of curses of anger. And these tears in the long run will break down barriers which are armour-plated against the thunderbolts of wrath. All the great souls have had this love, this forbearing outlook on others, and it has kept them strong amid a thousand peering littlenesses.

3. *How does this peace come?* It comes from a perfect surrender and response to the love of God in all its challenge and all its security. And the love of God is a challenging thing. The love of God, if we take it in, throws our souls open to the assault of countless needs and ills, and to a tempest of rebuke. We have made too much of religion as a safety device for the soul, too much of it as a quiet haven of rest into which we retire and find peace. The price of Christ’s peace is war. The cost of Christ’s rest is struggle. ‘My peace,’ said Christ, ‘I give to you.’ What lives the disciples

led after that gift ! There was scarcely a day when they were free from trouble. It was the condition of their peace.

The honourable peace which this utter surrender to the love of God brings is thus a twofold thing. It calls us to battle. There is no peace we can accept for ourselves so long as the world is full of the sin and suffering which make the lives of others unhealthy and unholy. There is no rest from mortal fight for any of us so long as our hearts are tainted with selfishness and pride. For the man who loves with the love of Jesus, and who enters into an alliance with Him, there is no languorous ease, no sheltered garden where he can slink out of the dust and heat. The love of God is a tide which will carry us out into the lives of others, and give us over to the throb of the world's agony.

But it means moving out too, in response to the assurance of God's love. The security which God gives is the assurance that He will never see us beaten. We shall be equal to every situation into which love may bring us. There is no dilemma into which faith carries us but there will be a way out. There is no trouble which meets us, if we have committed our lives to this love, which shall not turn to our advantage as His children. That is the kind of peace which the early Church had. 'Troubled on every side, but not distressed; perplexed, but not in despair; cast down, but not destroyed; dying, and behold we live; having nothing, yet possessing all things.' This is the peace Christ gives through faith in Him and fellowship with Him, and that is the peace we are called to reach and make our own to-day—the only kind of honourable peace. We reach it through a faith that rests on the resources of our amazing Lord, while we follow Him out to battle. It is to that toiling, suffering, invincible faith that Christ calls us—not to the faith that confuses peace with ease and the untroubled life. His peace is found in a service and a fellowship which give us together the troubled life and the untroubled heart.¹

I ask no heaven, till earth be Thine,
No glory-crown while work of mine remaineth here.
When earth shall shine among the stars,
Her sins wiped out, her captives free—
Her voice a music unto Thee—
For crown, more work give Thou to me,
Lord, here am I.

¹ J. Reid, *The Victory of God*, 223.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Task of Peace.

'So, then, let us follow after the things which make for peace.'—Ro 14¹⁹.

These words speak of peace not as something which once achieved stands for ever by its own virtue, but as something which must always be sought, and wooed and won and cherished, all with a certain unrelieved misgiving that at any moment it may begin to be lost. St. Paul, in these words, corrects us in a mistake into which we are always ready to fall—the mistake of imagining that peace is an event, and itself the end of a process, upon the attainment of which we may rest and let ourselves off the strain. What he says about peace, in the restricted sense which perhaps was all that he intended at the moment, is something which is equally true of a state of harmony amongst the nations of the earth.

The general principle of the saying—'Let us follow after the things which make for peace'—is simple and obvious. Whether peace shall come to the whole world, and, having come, shall stay, that, in a sense, is not our business. That may be as it may be. What, however, is our business is the rising up in our secret minds, and from our secret minds infecting our words and our actions, of moods, of passions, of hard feelings which we must curb and rebuke and put down, as we might put down vermin—to deal with all that is our business. For there is a point at which and after which we are all helpless. But there is a point at which and up to which we are not helpless.

It would be a fair paraphrase of St. Paul's words to make him say, not 'Let us follow after the things that make for peace,' but 'Let us all have the will-to-peace.' Let us believe in peace. Let us each say to himself and to one another, 'I believe in peace,' meaning, 'I'm in for peace,' 'I'm going to vote for the things that make for peace.' I know the things which, when they are done to me, make me angry. Very well, then; I am going to avoid doing them to any human being. On the other hand, I know the things which, when they are done to me, make me feel ashamed of ever having entertained a harsh feeling towards any one, and most of all—if this has been the case—towards the one who is now showing me such things. Very well, then; I propose henceforth to do towards others those things, and to maintain that kind of

countenance which when done or shown towards myself make me throw away my arms and trample in secret on my own bad heart.

There is a sense in which it is only with regard to things which to the natural reason of man are difficult or impossible we say 'We believe in them.' 'Credo quia impossibile' is an old religious maxim from the age of faith. What the words mean is surely this: I believe in this thing which has dawned upon me, because it is too good not to be true. It is beset by such difficulties, it so runs in the teeth of my own indolence and selfishness, that it can never have come from my own brain. Yet there it is—a dream, a vision, a summons; away down in my soul I acknowledge it as good. I confess that it would be a great and blessed thing could it be achieved. And yet in my own strength and with my own resources the thing is quite impossible. What then? Why, I must believe that there is another level of life, of thinking and of action, in which this thing which seems impossible to me on my natural level may nevertheless be reached. The fact is, this is what we mean at the least when we say we believe in God. We mean: we believe that the highest is the truth, that the best is the very thing which might well happen.

What are the things that make for peace? It will be found, as in other regions, that in this matter also the powerful things are very simple. Fresh air, plain food, an honest day's work, and a heart at peace with God—six months of that would bring back the whole world to health and friendliness.

Here are a few simple things which make for peace.

1. Let us try to be fair to other peoples of the earth. Let us, for example, never forget—it was Sir Thomas Browne, of Norwich, who first stated the matter in so many words—that we differ from others just as much as they differ from us. The

other man or the other nation has its own point of view. If there is something about another nation which we do not like, there will be something about us which that nation will not like. A man is not a patriot but a fool and mischievous who wants the whole world to have his own or his nation's unqualified characteristics. That was the great principle which, Ezekiel tells us, saved him on one occasion when he was about to let himself go in anger: 'I sat where they sat.'

2. Another deep and simple principle of reconciliation between people and nations is a common loyalty to some accepted moral code, say the Ten Commandments. There is a fine saying of Holy Scripture that 'peace for evermore is the effect of righteousness.'

3. But the great and fine and holy way by which peoples and nations come together and stay together is by them, one and all, living for deep and unworldly things. It is the things of this world which divide us, and chiefly is it greed of gain. The unseen things unite us—things of beauty in music, in literature, in art, and—in the supreme art—in life. Life seen in all its pathos, overshadowed by the eternities, interpreted by faith in God's love for us all—it is that which draws us nearer to one another.

There is a beautiful image in a psalm where we read of the companies of worshippers going up to Jerusalem, one company joining another by the way, their numbers swelling as they go. 'They go from strength to strength, every one of them appeareth before God.'

Upon this image, Dr. King, of Greyfriars, long ago made this excellent and profound observation: 'When the companies begin to hail each other, and to meet, it is a proof that they are nearing the City of God.'¹

¹ J. A. Hutton, *Discerning the Times*, 221.

The Cross of Christ and my Uttermost Fartbing.

BY THE REVEREND A. G. HOGG, M.A., D.LITT., MADRAS CHRISTIAN COLLEGE.

ARE there, perhaps, others besides the present writer who feel that the most urgent need of the Christian pulpit to-day, in respect of the great subject of guilt and atonement, is apposite popular formulæ? It goes without saying that, besides

new ways of formulating that central marvel of our faith, there is also required a deeper understanding; for in sounding the depths of what it must cost a sinless Spirit to forgive and redeem sinners the plummet of a sinful mind can never touch bottom.

Nevertheless, if my own experience be any trustworthy index to what others are likely to be feeling, I should not be surprised to find that many, who, having revolted from the older formulæ, have thought their way far enough into the meaning of the Cross to have reached the conviction that only through the Crucified can there be adequate atonement, will confess that in this matter their own inward comprehension, however imperfect it still may be, has run ahead of their powers of popular exposition. When at liberty to use the abstract distinctions among which the theologian is at home, they may be able to write profoundly, or even inspiringly, of forgiveness through the Cross; but to coin a telling formula which will linger fruitfully in the minds of the simple, without being harmfully inadequate, seems peculiarly difficult.

In my own case, for instance, the line of return to belief in a genuinely objective atonement, purged of the idea of penal substitution, has been along the abstract pathway of a criticism of categories. Careful analysis has seemed to show me that merit is not an ultimate but a derivative category; that, in virtue of the principle of continuity, individual wrong-doing must, in a moral universe, be wiped out not in individual but in common suffering; that in the spirit of justice, at its highest, there is an unescapable impulse to 'turn the other cheek'; that offended love, at its richest, must needs be exacting; and that, while 'principles' may justly be predicated in respect of even a Divine will, 'laws,' whether legal or natural, are merely expedients of the finite understanding. And the result of this slow process of analysis has been to make me feel that, in a sense, the true theory of the Atonement is simply the perception that no theory is needed—that what atones is no single act which can be pointed to as fulfilling some abstract necessity, but is the whole complex way in which, in Providence, in an Incarnation unto death, and in Regeneration, the Will of God has been reacting against sin, and that instead of trying to justify this complex Divine reaction by analogy with our human institutions, we need to justify our human methods of dealing with wrong by the degree in which they approach that self-demonstratingly adequate Divine mode of reaction. Yet, while such a line of thought may satisfy a mind which has practised some criticism of categories, something simpler or more homely is required for those who have not the leisure or the gift for abstract reflection. That which

will release them alike from those imperfect human conceptions of mercy which cheapen free forgiveness, and from the lingering influence of legalistic conceptions which challenge the right to forgive, must be suggestive analogy rather than abstract analysis.

Even more, then, than we need insight, we need a new doctrinal symbol—something which, for the mind of to-day, would be as simple and as appealing as the idea of penal substitution was for an earlier generation. And surely a helpful first step to that goal might be some pooling of preachers' formulæ. Let any one who has had the good fortune to light on a figure or formula which seems to him, in any degree, at once apposite and popularly effective, share his discovery. Then, amongst such modest finds there might some day be recognized one worthy of being cut and polished into a jewel of price—that new-old doctrinal formulation for which the Church is waiting.

In what follows I venture to set forth one of these modest finds—not a doctrine but a mere preacher's formula. The principle on which it rests is that no price which selfishness can possibly pay is adequate as a reckoning for sin. What selfishness is capable of suffering may be very terrible in quantity or intensity, but it is too poor in quality. Only by being crucified with Christ can I make just amends for my sin; and it is only as, through His crucifixion, He enables me to be crucified with Him, that His Cross avails as my atonement. The formula in which I seek to express this conception may very possibly have been lighted on already by some one else; but if so, his sharing of it has not reached me, and there may be others also whom it has not reached. At any rate, in the case of so modest a find priority is a matter of no moment.

The formula falls short of expressing all the aspects of even my own imperfect insight into the Atonement, but it seems to me free from misleading suggestions. Every sinner—so the formulation runs—has to pay the uttermost farthing, but there are different currencies in which it may be paid. There is a currency which means bitterness and death, and there is a currency which means love and life. It is only payment in the latter currency that really cancels the debt; payment in the former merely bankrupts the debtor. None can escape paying to the uttermost farthing; yet what currency a man has to pay in depends partly upon himself but more upon his brother-men. And

by an Incarnation unto death—by living for us as a Brother-Man and suffering to the uttermost at our hands, God has made it possible for us to pay to the last farthing in the currency which means love and life. We deserve to pay the reckoning in the currency which means death; but the forgiving God is One who holds it right to treat all men better than they deserve, and it is His holy ambition to enable each of us to pay in the currency which really cancels the debt—the regenerating currency of reconciliation and love.

If I were preaching to Hindus, I might express the matter still more simply by saying that the Incarnation unto death redeems us, not by abolishing our 'karma,' but by transmuting it; and, thus simplified, the formula might perhaps almost serve in India as a doctrinal symbol. The idea of an inevitable reckoning for debt seems to me to be, possibly, the nearest approach, in English, to the conception which the Indian term 'karma' conveys, of a type of consequence which is inevitable without being mechanical, and is punitive without being extrinsic to the causal nexus. Nevertheless, in selecting the analogy on which to base a doctrinal symbol, one would fain look outside the sphere of financial transactions, and so, even if it be otherwise acceptable, my suggested method of statement can, in its English dress, be nothing more than a preacher's formula.

As I have already remarked, while doubtless inadequate, this formula appears to myself in no respect misleading. Like every mere formula, it bristles with presuppositions, but I think that for every one of them I could put up a strong defence. To do so in a scientific manner, however, would require a book, not an article. Instead of this I will offer—what is perhaps a more appropriate way of defending a preacher's formula—the kind of defensive exposition that might find place in a sermon.

Let any one, I might say, in whom the unfamiliarity of this formula breeds suspicion of its soundness, ask himself whether all that has been above affirmed is not pictured forth in the most familiar of our Lord's parables. The Prodigal Son deserved the death of a penniless debauchee in an unsympathetic alien land. The Elder Brother in the story shared the point of view of the average self-righteous man who approves of other people being treated exactly as they deserve. But the Father was one who counted it right, in his treatment of his sons, not to limit himself by their deservingness but to hold

his all at their service. He freely forgave the Prodigal's unfilial past, and by welcoming him back to the trustful fellowship which he had forfeited he saved him from the miserable end that he deserved.

The Father forgave the Prodigal, and by forgiving redeemed him. Yet not by one farthing did he diminish the reckoning which that son had to pay for his evil past; he only altered the currency in which payment had to be made. In fact it would be still truer to say that only by this forgiveness was the son enabled to pay the full reckoning.

The Prodigal's past had to be paid for. His hours of guilty pleasure had inevitably to visit themselves upon him in resources irrevocably wasted, health undermined, reputation destroyed. But in what currency was this dire payment to be made? In one which really paid the debt, or only in one which bankrupted the debtor? This depended on whether the son was forgiven and restored. Had he remained impenitent and unforgiven, he would certainly have had to pay to his last farthing, by ending his life in misery, disgrace, and bitter remorse; but who would have been advantaged thereby? His moral debt would have remained unpaid; for although his power of further mischief-making would be ended, there would linger on, still uncounteracted, the mischief he had already wrought. Still would his father's heart have smarted at the memory of his unfilial desertion; still would the scandal of his selfishness have been bandied from mouth to mouth, shocking the conscience of the neighbourhood and lowering the traditions of family life. But how much more adequate was the reckoning which, by forgiveness and restoration, the Prodigal was enabled to pay! Sorrow there would be in abundance, but instead of the destroying anguish of a remorse-racked soul in a starving body, it would be the healing sorrow of penitent understanding. How many soul-renewing tears would he shed in secret, as restored intercourse with his father brought new comprehension of all that that father had suffered! How much purifying shame would he feel at having, in place of his own wasted possessions, to accept as free gift the resources of others! How regenerating an understanding of the folly of wickedness there would come to him as, with weary patience, he tried to build up again an undermined constitution and slowly to recover an honourable reputation! Yes, painful the reckoning would be—a very torture

of purgation. Who that knows how scorching is the penitence that is born of free forgiveness will fail to wonder whether it be not a reckoning for sin more searching than any other?

But not only does it search the sinner; it also pays the debt. Was it not so in the Prodigal's case? Was not the wound of his father's heart healed? Were not the traditions of family life restored and ennobled? Did not the conscience of the neighbourhood now have an uplifting story to ponder on? And was there not now in the world a penitent, with a tender understanding of all prodigals and wastrels, who would be a power for social good wherever he went? The impenitent and unforgiven pay their reckoning in a currency which bankrupts the debtor but does not clear his debt. The currency in which the forgiven and reconciled are enabled to pay their reckoning is one which both clears away the debt and regenerates the soul.

To whom, now, must we attribute, in the story of the Prodigal, the credit of this worthy kind of reckoning—this only adequate form of justice? In this credit the son doubtless has some share, but his share is swallowed up in that of the father. What was it that helped the son, when misery had broken his haughty spirit, to dream that so outraged a parent might still treat him with distant charity? Was it not his memory's picture of his father as a man of moderation and equity—the picture which that father had long ago imprinted on his son's mind by years of fair and honourable dealing? And when the Prodigal reached the paternal home with his carefully conned confession and proposal for a sort of armistice, what was it that broke down his last defences, melting his surly shame into whole-hearted contrition? Was it not the discovery that his father still was, and ever had been, on the outlook for his return? Was it not the sight of his father running so eagerly to meet him? Was it not experience of a measureless

generosity of pardon? And what was it that completed his repentance, gradually making of him once more an upright and self-respecting man, a loyal and devoted member of the family? Was it not that the father's generosity did not end with that first day's welcome, but fulfilled itself daily in a new fellowship, in which father and son shouldered together the losses of the past, and together lived down its shame? Beyond all question, then, although the son might deserve some credit, it had its roots in his father's goodness, and is lost to sight amid the grandeur of that father's burden-bearing.

In all this we have a very perfect parable of God in Christ. It is God's self-revelation—above all, His self-revelation in our Lord Jesus—that begins our repentance. And that repentance is gradually brought to fullness of contrition and utter surrender by the generosity of our pardon, and by our finding with how perfect an understanding Christ shoulders with us the burden of our past, never minimizing its gravity or evading its reckoning. Our sins cry to heaven for visitation, and they are visited to the last farthing. But their impact falls not upon us by ourselves, but upon us and our Redeemer together. We are forgiven for love's dear sake; yet we are forgiven, not that we may escape the reckoning, but that we may be enabled to pay it to the uttermost, in a currency which brings life instead of death because it is coined in our Redeemer's blood. Christ was crucified for us. He was crucified for love's sake, and also that we might one day be crucified with Him. And in nothing was His crucifixion more completely for our sake than in its purpose of enabling us to pay our reckoning in the sore but debt-clearing currency of contrition and charity and service. We are crucified with Christ; nevertheless we live. And it is because we are daily crucified with Him in the common penalty of a whole world's sin, that the life which in us He lives is the life that creates new heavens and a new earth.

Contributions and Comments.

The Meaning of Acts xxvi. 28.

THE Note of Mr. E. E. Kellett in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for September 1923 is certainly interesting. It is clear that *ἐν ὀλίγῳ* cannot mean

'almost' as would be true of *ὀλίγου* or *ἐξ ὀλίγου*. It must mean 'in short (or little) time,' 'in small measure,' 'with little argument' (by a short cut), or some such idea. But there remains the difficulty of *με πείθεις Χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι*. Instead of such

a radical change in the text as Mr. E. E. Kellett suggests, changing *πείθεις* to *τίθεις*, why not see the conative idea in *πείθεις* and the notion of purpose in *ποιῆσαι*? Both are common enough idioms. The only difficulty left on this plan is the implied repetition of *με* involved. But that again is a well-known idiom. The pronoun is by no means always repeated where the meaning is clear without it.

Tischendorf on Acts 26²⁸ quotes the Coptic translation as meaning *mihi persuades facere me*. Tischendorf is positive that *ποιῆσαι* is here used in the sense of *ὥστε ποιῆσαι*. But the sense of purpose in the infinitive by no means demands the use of *ὥστε* or *τοῦ* (cf. p. 1088, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*).

It may be granted that the sentence is rather compact and heavily charged with ideas when thus interpreted, but not unduly so. It was a quick retort by Agrippa to Paul's thrust—v. 27. Paul caught the point of Agrippa's instantly, but employs *γενέσθαι* in his reply (v. 29). The late manuscripts (the Syrian class) and apparently some Western documents read *γενέσθαι* in v. 28. But this is an obvious attempt to make the meaning plainer.

If we take the sentence as suggested, the translation would be something like this: 'With little argument, you are trying to persuade me in order to make me a Christian.' That is in strict accord with Greek idiom at every point, follows the text of the oldest manuscripts, and makes good sense in harmony with the context.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Louisville, Ky.

A Further Note on Simon the Crucifer.

FOLLOWING on the Rev. A. B. Kinsey's interesting attempt to identify Simon of Cyrene and Symeon Niger in the November issue of this journal, I want to make another suggestion with respect to the Crucifer. The suggestion is this: that we owe to him the account of our Lord's crucifixion contained in Mark's Gospel. For observe, (i) that this man, Simon of Cyrene, afterwards became a member of the Christian community, and for a time at any rate probably made his home in Jerusalem. What more likely than that John Mark and his friends would seek for information from one who had been brought into such close association with our Lord

at the time when His own disciples had deserted Him altogether, or were at any rate only witnesses afar off? Simon of Cyrene would be questioned again and again, and asked to relate all he could remember with respect to those dread hours. (ii) Simon was not, of course, a disciple when he was impressed to carry the cross. And when he had done what was required of him he would be in no hurry to take his departure. Thus he became a close witness of the Crucifixion scene, and if Mark's account is examined it will be found to contain just those incidents which such a man so situated would be likely to remember.

Evidently the evangelist's story must have come originally from some one who was an eye-witness of what happened, which Simon Peter certainly was not. If Mark's informant had been one of our Lord's followers, the account would have been much scantier and less complete than it is; the women who were 'beholding from afar' (15⁴⁰), for example, could not have supplied the details which the record contains. If, on the other hand, the evangelist's informant had been one of the soldiers or the centurion 'who stood by,' the account would have been much fuller than it is. But this man, Simon of Cyrene, not one of the band of executioners and not one of the frightened disciples, is just the sort of man who would supply such an account as we have in the Second Gospel, with the exception of v. 38 and the cry of Jesus in v. 34. For example, he was not near enough to hear any of the Seven Words from the Cross, or he did not understand or remember them: he heard nothing of what passed between Jesus and the two robbers crucified with Him; all he records is that they 'reproached him.' But he was near enough to observe our Lord's refusal of the wine mingled with myrrh; he was near enough to watch the soldiers casting lots for the garments of the Crucified; he was near enough also to hear the remark about Elijah, and the comment of the centurion after Jesus was dead. His story, so often told, was at last written down, and our suggestion is that it is this account which Mark has embodied in his Gospel: it was one of the 'authorities, some perhaps documentary, which had been familiar to the evangelist before he left the Holy City,' and of which he made use, especially in his last six chapters. (See Dr. H. B. Swete's *Mark*, lxxv.)

ARTHUR T. BURBRIDGE.

Northwich.

The Text of Habakkuk ii. 4.

It is strange that the verse which apparently contains the central teaching of the prophecy of Habakkuk should be in part so corrupt as to be almost unintelligible. Chap. i recounts the development of the prophet's moral difficulty, as he realizes that the Chaldeans, whom God has sent to punish Judah, are more wicked than those they are devouring. The prophet goes to his watch-tower, and is given instructions to publish abroad the great principle which is to be enunciated. But when we come to the message, we find only its second part. The first part is most obscure, and no very satisfactory reconstruction of it has yet been given.

The corruption is an early one, as evidenced by the variety of renderings in the Versions. The Greek of the LXX and of Aquila, and the Latin of the Vulgate, differ from the Hebrew and from each other, without suggesting any satisfactory interpretation. One would expect some sort of anti-

thesis to the second stych (which is evidently intact)—‘the just shall live by his faithfulness.’ This is in fact just what is suggested by the Targum **הָא רְשָׁעִיא אֶפְרִין** and the Syriac **ܫܡܥ ܠܢ ܕܢܚܝܐ ܢܚܝܐ**.

The following emendation is suggested as supplying the required antithesis, with the least disarrangement of the Massoretic text, and at the same time making use of the hint supplied by the Syriac and the Targum:

הִנֵּה פֹעֵל רָשָׁע חָנָף יִשָּׁכַב וְצַדִּיק בְּאַמּוֹנָתוֹ יֵחִי:

‘Behold, the evil-doer shall die polluted, but the just shall live by his faithfulness.’

This reading requires the insertion only of the letter **ע**. The other changes are easily explained by the confusion of similar letters and the running together of words, as may be seen by reference to the Massoretic text.

R. B. Y. SCOTT.

Toronto.

Entre Nous.

A SERIES of articles on ‘Religious Movements of the Time’ will begin shortly in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. Among the contributors to it will be the Reverend the Hon. E. Lyttelton, D.D., who will write on ‘Religion and Education’; Professor W. A. Curtis of Edinburgh University, on ‘Church Union’; R. H. Thouless, Esq., M.A., of Manchester University, on ‘Psychology and Religion’; and Professor B. W. Bacon of Yale, on ‘Fundamentalism.’

The sermon series will be continued, and sermons for general and also for special occasions will appear month by month. Within the next few months there will be sermons by Professor Jackson of Didsbury, the Ven. Archdeacon R. H. Charles, D.D., the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen, Professor Elmslie, Westminster College, and Dr. J. D. Jones of Bournemouth.

The Centenary of the Publishing House of T. & T. Clark.

Just a hundred years ago Mr. Thomas Clark, the founder of the Firm of T. & T. Clark, moved, in Edinburgh, from premises in Parliament Street to George Street, and in George Street the Firm

has remained ever since. Some years later Mr. Thomas Clark took his nephew, another Thomas Clark, into partnership, and from that time the Firm was known as T. & T. Clark. Messrs. T. & T. Clark have not desired publicity about their centenary, but the Editors of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES believe that its readers will like to have recalled some of the facts of the Firm's distinguished history.

It is further fitting that it should be done at the present time, because a change has just taken place in the Firm. Sir John Maurice Clark has retired. It is fifty years since he first came to George Street, and twenty-three years since he became Head of the Firm. We rejoice that his retirement does not mean that he will sever his connexion with George Street, but only that he will have more leisure, and that the burden of responsibility will now fall upon Mr. Thomas Clark, his eldest son.

The new Head of the Firm has been in partnership with his father for a number of years, and all who know him know that he will carry on the great traditions of the Firm, and with the utmost acceptance.

It was as publishers of Law and Foreign Books

that Messrs. T. & T. Clark began. One of the first series was 'The Biblical Cabinet'—forty-five volumes of translations of German Commentaries and Theological Works. Then the Early Fathers were made accessible, in the 'Ante-Nicene Christian Library,' and St. Augustine's Works; and more important still the 'Foreign Theological Library' was begun. It year by year introduced fresh examples of the best German and French Theology to English readers. In 'The Bookseller' of July 1882, a Wesleyan Methodist Professor spoke of it in the phraseology of that time as 'the richest bed of Biblical Theology proper in our language.'

From this time onwards the enterprise and sagacity of the Firm gave the Theological World many of its outstanding works. Three eminent scholars—Professor S. R. Driver, the Rev. Alfred Plummer, and Professor C. A. Briggs—were secured as editors of a series of Commentaries, International and Inter-Confessional, based upon a thorough critical study of the original texts of the Bible, and upon critical methods of interpretation, to be known as 'The International Critical Commentary.' Their 'International Theological Library' is also recognized as a standard series of Theological Text-books.

There is no space to speak of the other series which appeared and the many standard works, but in 'The Life of Alexander Whyte' just published, we have his account of the beginning of the series of 'Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students.' Dr. Whyte saw that a series of Handbooks for Bible Classes was needed, and he made the suggestion to the Clarendon Press, 'but they intimated that they had no intention of issuing such a work.' We next hear that he had spoken 'on the subject to Dr. Marcus Dods of Glasgow, and Mr. Clark, a publisher,' and that 'by this time [1876] the work was fairly under way. These works would put their cultivated young men on a level with technical scholars and in the front rank of all ascertained knowledge.'

The 'Mr. Clark' to whom Dr. Whyte spoke was Mr. Thomas Clark (afterwards Sir Thomas Clark), the nephew of the Founder of the Firm, and the grandfather of the present Head of the Firm. We have quoted this incident because it is typical.

From 1889 Messrs. T. & T. Clark have published THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, and from that year dated their long and close connexion with Dr. Hastings, the nature of which is seen from his dedication of

THE DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE 'to the memory of Sir Thomas Clark, Bart.,' and THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS 'to Sir John Maurice Clark, Bart., Publisher and Friend.'

This connexion led to that great succession of Dictionaries: THE DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, THE ONE-VOLUME BIBLE DICTIONARY, THE DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS, THE DICTIONARY OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH, and last, the greatest of the succession, THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. The twelve volumes of the Encyclopædia are a library in themselves. They deal exhaustively with any subject that falls within the science of comparative religion, with ethics, metaphysics, psychology, archæology, and anthropology. With courage and with a foresight which will surely have its reward, the Firm continued during the War to issue this monumental work. Reviewing the twelfth volume, 'The Scotsman' called it 'the greatest literary undertaking ever attempted in Scotland,' 'a work which is bound to occupy a unique position in the Scholarly World for many a long day to come.'

And in the future other important works are projected. We may instance one: 'A Concordance to the Authorised, Revised, and Standard American Versions of the Bible.' This Concordance was prepared by Dr. Hastings, assisted by a number of eminent scholars. In addition to being a Concordance to the different versions, it shows at a glance all the Hebrew and Greek words translated by the English word; it notifies a change made by the revisers and shows what the change is; and in short commentary articles it explains the meaning of every word or phrase in the Bible that is not at once intelligible to the ordinary reader.

SOME TOPICS.

Home-Grown Religion.

Principal L. P. JACKS, D.D., LL.D., is nothing if not unexpected. What is education? he asks, in *A Living Universe* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net), and while we are thinking out an answer breaks in to tell us there is none until we have determined whether the Universe is dead or alive. Perhaps you had not thought of that. But then his conception of education is a very lofty one. There are not three steps in it, he says—primary, secondary, higher. There are four; and the last, 'the highest,' is religion; and any and every

education that does not run into that, and end there, fails. Not that religion is a thing tacked on as an afterthought. It permeates the whole. 'Where in your time-table do you teach religion?' he asked a great schoolmaster. 'We teach it all day long. We teach it in arithmetic, by accuracy. We teach it in language, by learning to say what we mean—"yea, yea, and nay, nay." . . . We teach it in geography, by breadth of mind. We teach it in handicraft, by thoroughness. We teach it in astronomy, by reverence.' And so on through the whole curriculum. All education ought to be religious, and religion is 'education raised to its highest power.' 'I do not want,' concluded this teacher, 'religion brought into this school from outside. *What we have of it we grow ourselves.*'

That type of education is the hope to which our author clings. Apart from it things seem to him almost intolerably dark. In particular, the politicians and all talking men fill him with something like despair. One surmises that the text of this little book was that remark of Mr. Lloyd George that government to-day is 'government by talk.' That raises Dr. Jacks to a kind of melancholy frenzy, to the purest Carlylism one has read for long enough—a passionate protest against substituting talk for action, an appeal to us to escape out of this babble into a healing hush of quiet and purposefulness. Act, act, act, he cries, and be silent, very silent. He has small patience with our urgings of ourselves and others on, still less with the poor dreams with which, face to face with our drab lives, we console ourselves, and make shift to maintain some self-respect. The best cannot be spoken, it can only be done. What would you know of goodness had you never seen it lived? The best cannot be put into words, but it is always 'actable.' And the Christian faith is supreme because it is so 'actable.' Act God, don't just talk about Him: act freedom, act immortality, by living a life too big to go out. As for the theologians, let them sift out from the creeds what is actable, and cling to that, letting the rest float down the stream.

If we are simply going to talk about Leagues of Nations and the like, and do nothing, our civilization seems doomed; and perhaps, he thinks, that is no great loss. For this civilization of ours is a poor affair, is indeed repulsive to the great mass of mankind, though it suits us fairly well, is a mere political contrivance, whereas true

civilization were a cultural thing, aiming not at power but at the best life for the individual and for the whole. Such civilizations there have been, he says. One wonders where, and still more if those who lived under them would recognize them here. For as he describes it, civilization seems to be just another name for ideal Christianity in action.

Towards such a civilization he hopes we are tending—hopes partly because of the new passion for education, which he takes to be a sign of the human spirit reaching out towards this. Perhaps. Or is it often just a hope of getting on? Some there are not a little depressed by a type of education that has so far resulted in the most jumpy, snippety journalese age that the world has seen for long, an education which seems very remote from Dr. Jacks' definition of what that should be. Interesting? Yes. Efficient? Perhaps, for certain things. But religious!

Blessed are the Inclusive.

Lady Henry Somerset died in 1921 at the age of sixty-nine. She made Miss Kathleen Fitzpatrick her literary executor, and the latter has now written an account of her life (*Lady Henry Somerset*: Cape; 10s. 6d. net). Up to the end, Miss Fitzpatrick says, Lady Henry Somerset was so young at heart that, passing the shop where her tulle ball-dresses had been made nearly fifty years ago, she would stop, "not to buy anything," she would explain, "but just to look at the new things you have brought back from Paris." The clothes young girls were wearing interested her most, the pretty dance frocks so unlike the fashions of her youth.'

'This life is such a tiny part of a great whole,' she had written at the back of an old diary, 'we cannot hope to solve the riddle of life. We must never think we cannot hold two inconsistent views.' Her own death, now very near for her since her sister had gone, and the prettiness of a girl's ball-dress, were two thoughts she could hold quite easily in her mind. This quality of inclusiveness was one of Lady Henry Somerset's outstanding characteristics. When she went to the States in 1891 on temperance work, Miss Frances Willard met her for the first time, and it was this quality of inclusiveness which impressed Miss Willard most. 'Watching her guest,' we are told, 'she thought of a new beatitude: Blessed are the inclusive; for they shall be included.'

During her temperance work Lady Henry Somerset came into contact with another American lady, Mrs. Pearsall Smith. When a friend confessed that the condition of the London slums was a hindrance to her faith, Mrs. Smith had declared that she did not worry about slums, 'they were Heavenly Father's housekeeping.' 'Lady Henry,' Miss Fitzpatrick says, 'never accepted Mrs. Smith's cheerful doctrine of the rest in faith in Heavenly Father's housekeeping.'

Most of the material for this Biography has been got from letters, considerable portions of which are quoted. The only criticism which we would make of it is this: it is too short. When we finished it we had an appetite for more.

The Untheologically-Minded.

The Rev. Hubert L. Simpson of Glasgow has just published a volume of 'Essays for the Untheologically-Minded.' In the introduction he lets us see a little of what is in his mind about the untheologically-minded. First he speaks of the dress of the preacher. 'To wear the conventional mid-Victorian dress, for the clothing of the preacher's person does appear to submit the wearer to the handicap of beginning "two down," as one witty and successfully unconventional King's chaplain expressed it the other day. Even the Primate, judging by a recent utterance, seems anxious to reduce the handicap, while the journal which is so solicitous about providing the rising generation with Savings Certificates, is just as ready to help in delivering embarrassed prelates from the tyranny of a garb that is no longer necessary in times when all the riding which they are called upon to do is that of their favourite hobby, or the tea-cup storm of an Anglo-Catholic Congress.'

Mr. Simpson then leaves dress and turns his attention to the address. He finds that there is urgent need of reform in the clothing of the message as in the clothing of the preacher. The message must be natural, intelligible, and attractive, but further it must be the message of men 'possessed by a force' and not 'obsessed by a formula.'

The subjects of Mr. Simpson's essays are taken from the Old Testament Scriptures. The title of the volume is *Put Forth by the Moon* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net), for 'as sunlight is to moonlight, so is the revelation of the New to that of the Old, but we join in the ancient thanksgiving

for "the precious things put forth by the moon." ' The Essays—twenty in number—are direct, sincere and provoke thought. We quote one in 'The Christian Year,' and we shall be surprised if those who read it do not get the volume in order to read the other nineteen.

St. Paul and Women.

'His great principle stands, "There is no room for male and female, you are all one in Christ Jesus." But the difficulty emerges in the application of the principle. In Corinth, as in other places—but Corinth was especially guilty—immorality was bound up in the religion of the city, and the emancipated woman was largely of the type of those who had lost their crown. The Church had a ceaseless battle to fight for purity of life, and the limitation of personal liberty was nothing compared with victory. For Christian women to outrage the conventions of the time by appearing and taking their part with men in public life would have been a shattering blow to the reputation of the Church. Even in spite of all safeguards and restrictions, accusations of wrong and infamous conduct were scattered abroad by evil-minded people against Christianity as a system, and against Christians. We know how indignantly these charges were denied by pure-minded women, and the denial was confirmed by Pliny, the governor of Bithynia, in his rescript to the Emperor Trajan. But the purity of the Church and the high character of its women could be made plain to the world only by ceaseless vigilance, and by the limitation of its liberty for the sake of the distress of the times, "and for wrath's sake." That this *morale* was thoroughly maintained may be read in the envious admiration of pagan society—"what women these Christians have!" Much of what seems reactionary to us, in the Pauline and Pastoral Epistles, is due to obvious facts—the necessities of the age, the widely prevalent expectation that the *Parousia*, the second coming of Christ, was close at hand; the growing asceticism in some quarters may also have had a certain depressing influence on Christian liberty. These and similar reasons are responsible for what has been called the *emergency legislation* unfavourable to the rights of women. But the limitation stands, with the so-called Communism of the early Church, the attitude to meats offered to idols, and the question of the slave, as a temporary

and positive regulation due to the practical necessities of the day.¹

Two Types of Mysticism.

'In endless debates with my students in Heidelberg and Berlin, with my colleagues, and with preachers in conferences and at holiday courses, it has become clear to me that it is most essential to distinguish two chief types of mysticism. In both cases, what is under discussion is a personal communion of the individual with God, direct intercourse with God. This directness of intercourse with the Deity seems to me to be the essential thing in every kind of mysticism. Between God and man there is here no intervention of doctrinaire hair-splitting, no system of objective salvation and of salvation subjectively appropriated, no apparatus of rites, no bridge of priesthood and saints. Instead of that, there exists an immediate contact, an "I" speaks to a "thou," unites with Him: in Him lives, moves, and has its being. That is the general description of what we call mysticism.

'Now there are two main types which seem to me to be distinguished from one another. The one type is everywhere present where the mystic regards his communion with God as an experience in which the action of God upon him produces a reaction towards God. The other type of mysticism is that in which the mystic regards his communion with God as his own action, from which a reaction follows on the part of Deity.

'The token by which the distinction can be recognized is this: has the action of God, or the action of man, the priority? The one type is the mystic who reacts in response to the action of God. The other type is the mystic who, by his own action, endeavours to produce the divine reaction. In the end, the whole difference is equivalent to the contrast between the religion of grace and the religion of works. All depends on who has the initiative, whether God or man; and on this basis I distinguish between Reacting Mysticism and Acting Mysticism.'²

TWO ILLUSTRATIONS.

'Let me express it in a simile. There is an ocean—cold water without motion. In this ocean, however, is the Gulf Stream, hot water, flowing

from the Equator towards the Pole. Inquire of all scientists how it is physically imaginable that a stream of hot water flows between the waters of the ocean, which, so to speak, form its banks, the moving within the motionless, the hot within the cold: no scientist can explain it. Similarly, there is the God of love within the God of the forces of the universe—one with Him, and yet so totally different. We let ourselves be seized and carried away by that vital stream.'³

'Have you ever seen how they make bands of iron? You may observe two chief stages. There is a point at which an unformed piece of glowing iron goes through the rolling-mill. Writhing like a fiery serpent, it comes out in the shape of a band, white-hot and glittering. Workmen then grasp it with tongs and lay it on the ground, where it gradually becomes cold and loses all its glow. At this point, the second stage has begun. The bands are tied together in bundles with wires, and carried on waggons to the dealers. Anybody then can take them in his hands, buy them by weight, and use them in house and stable.

'The Teaching of Jesus, as we lay it up in store in our books, is like the iron bands which are sold all ready for use. But before that, these very bands were in the stage of white-hot, glittering metal. If we could succeed in transferring the words of Jesus back into this stage of white-hot blazing metal, then we could understand without difficulty His communion with God. On this point, again, it seems to me quite clear that extraordinary methods are required. The ordinary armoury of the study is not sufficient. It is the rare hours of solemn experience that help us here. For instance, in the fiery furnace of affliction most of us have probably realized that some familiar word of Jesus has at last been revealed to us in its true meaning. In many respects the last ten years have been for science a time of decline. For the greatest and most delicate task of historical science, for the reproduction of the historical Jesus, they may mean an inspiration. I do not believe I am in error when I say that among all peoples, through the great trouble of this time, a refining and deepening of the understanding of the real personality of Jesus has come about.'⁴

¹ W. M. Grant, *Ideals of the Early Church*, 98.

² A. Deissmann, *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*, 194 ff.

³ A. Schweitzer, *Christianity and the Religions of the World*, 78.

⁴ A. Deissmann, *ibid.* 25 f.

NEW POETRY.

Charles Venn Pilcher, D.D.

Dr. Charles Venn Pilcher, Professor of Old Testament Literature at Wycliffe College, Toronto, has published a small volume of selections from the Passion-Hymns of Hallgrim Petursson, the seventeenth-century Icelandic poet. The title of the book is *Icelandic Meditations on the Passion*, and it is published by Messrs. Longmans at 3s. 6d. net.

'It has been the custom in Iceland,' says the translator, 'in the scattered farm-houses, to sing the Passion-Hymns through during Lent. The implements of work would be laid down, and then, the spinning-wheels being hushed, the father would lead the household in sacred song. Thus the Story of the Cross, in Hallgrim's deathless setting, has for centuries sounded forth beneath the Northern Lights and the arctic stars.'

And now for the translations themselves. We shall offer one example, and perhaps the most quotable:

THE LOOK OF CHRIST.

'And the Lord turned, and looked upon Peter.'

And then the Saviour turned,
On Peter gazing—
A look divine, that yearned
With love amazing.

Swiftly to Peter's face
The shame came leaping;
He had denied such grace,
And went forth weeping.

Lord Jesus, look on me,
Thy kind face turning;
My soul with agony
Of sin is burning.

The way is long, I find
My weak steps falling:
O turn, to my dark mind
Thy grace recalling.

Of, oft with contrite eyes
I gaze to heaven;
Then, at Thy look, arise
In tears, forgiven.

Fay Inchfawn.

There is much for both mother and child in Fay Inchfawn's new volume of verse, *Through the Windows of a Little House* (Ward Lock; 2s. 6d. net). Let them read first 'What Bunty thought

of the Painters,' and then turn the pages to find this delightful child again. But we are not going to quote Bunty, because we should like to find room for 'Child-Soul':

CHILD-SOUL.

Child-soul is a little city
With its gates ajar,
Yet, to enter to its centre
I must travel far.
'Tis not an easy thing to win
The right to move and walk therein,
Though not to do so were a sin;
And I'll get in!

Child-soul has a little garden
Cloistered round with care;
And all my will and utmost skill
I'll need to get in there.
So rich the soil that waiting lies;
But I must seek anointed eyes,
And delve before the dewdrop dries.
Oh, I'll be wise!

Child-soul has a little temple
Opening on the street.
Curtained so deep, it seems asleep.
'Tis shut to tourists' feet.
Oh, little temple, glistening bright!
What if my hand be clean and white
Enough to lift your curtain right,
And let in—Light!

C. F. Keary.

Mr. C. F. Keary, *The Posthumous Poems* of whom have now been published (Blackwell; 7s. 6d. net), was not a great poet; yet he had the root of the matter in him. It is to be feared that he will never be a popular poet, but those who can appreciate a somewhat severe classical style will find much to repay a study of this volume. Mr. Keary set a high ideal before him. What 'he was always trying to do,' says John Bailey in an appreciatory introduction to the volume, 'was to recapture what was highest and purest in Greek religion.' And if his genius was not sufficient for this gigantic task, it is something to have attempted it. Yes, and to have come within measurable distance.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.